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Executive Summary

The World Heritage (WH) Convention began its work of inscribing sites on the World Heritage List in 1978. By 2002 the World Heritage Committee had approved nominations of 167 natural and "mixed" natural and cultural sites, all of these having been evaluated by IUCN. No "post audit" or evaluation of the achievements of the Convention in strengthening protection of individual sites has, however, been done. The main objective of this report will partially contribute to such an evaluation by reviewing how effective this unique international governance instrument, the World Heritage Convention, has been in conserving natural sites. The period of focus in this report is 1992-2002.

Achievements of the WH Convention can be examined by reviewing the record of the decisions of the WH Committee made:

(1) at the time when a site is being nominated and evaluated and

(2) after inscription when monitoring of the conservation status of sites is reported on.

In the first of these cases, the record indicates that the status of 35 sites was considerably improved usually by the process of deferring a decision until changes were made. In 17 of these cases the size of the site was enlarged, in 12 sites major improvements to management were made, in 11 sites additional funding was identified, in 9 sites the legal regime was strengthened and in 5, major threats to integrity were averted.

In six cases (involving 12 sites), however, no follow-up actions were made on key recommendations made by the WH Committee at inscription.

Achievements during the reactive monitoring process resulted in major conservation gains in 10 cases. In 8 of these, major proposed development projects that would have impacted on the sites were either cancelled or modified. In 4 cases the management regime was considerably strengthened. Monitoring activities in 10 other sites did not produce significant results.

The report concludes with a short review of lessons from the Ramsar Convention and offers some concluding comments on WH as an international governance tool for the select number of protected areas inscribed on the WH List.
**Résumé**


Pour étudier les réalisations de la Convention du PM, on peut passer en revue le rapport de décisions produit par le Comité du PM, 1) au moment où un site est mis en candidature et évalué; et 2) après l’inscription, quand on rend compte de son état de conservation.

Ainsi, le rapport indique que l’état de 35 sites s’est considérablement amélioré, habituellement parce que la prise de décision a été retardée jusqu’à ce que des changements soient apportés. Dans 17 cas, la superficie du site a été étendue; dans 12 sites, la gestion a fait l’objet d’améliorations majeures; dans 11 sites, des fonds additionnels ont été trouvés; dans 9 sites le régime juridique a été renforcé; et dans 5 sites, des menaces importantes à l’intégrité ont été éliminées.

Cependant, dans six cas (impliquant 12 sites), aucune mesure n’a été prise pour faire suite aux recommandations du Comité du PM au moment de l’inscription.

Les résultats obtenus pendant le processus de surveillance réactive ont permis des gains de conservation importants dans 10 cas. Dans 8 de ces cas, des projets d’aménagement majeurs, qui auraient eu un impact sur les sites, ont été soit annulés, soit modifiés. Dans 4 cas, le régime de gestion a été considérablement renforcé. Les activités de surveillance dans 10 autres sites n’ont pas donné de résultats probants.

Le rapport conclut avec un bref aperçu des leçons tirées de la Convention de Ramsar et offre des conclusions sur le PM en tant qu’outil de gouvernance pour les aires protégées inscrites sur la liste du PM.
RESUMEN

La Convención del Patrimonio Mundial (PM) comenzó su trabajo de inscribir sitios a la Lista del Patrimonio Mundial en 1978. En 2002 el Comité del Patrimonio Mundial ya había aprobado 167 sitios naturales y “mixtos”, naturales-culturales, propuestos, todos los cuales fueron evaluados por la UICN. Sin embargo, no se ha realizado una auditoría posterior o evaluación de los logros de la Convención en cuanto al fortalecimiento y la protección de estos sitios particulares. El objetivo principal del presente informe contribuirá parcialmente a esta evaluación mediante el examen de la eficiencia de este instrumento único de administración internacional de la Convención del Patrimonio Mundial en la conservación de los sitios naturales. El informe se concentra en el período de 1992 a 2002.

Los logros de la Convención del PM se pueden examinar revisando los archivos de las decisiones adoptadas por el Comité del PM:

(1) en el momento en que se propone y se evalúa un sitio y
(2) después de su inscripción, cuando se informa sobre el control del estado de conservación de los sitios.

En el primero de estos casos, los archivos indican que el estado de 35 sitios ha mejorado considerablemente generalmente mediante el proceso de diferir una decisión hasta que se hayan realizado cambios. En 17 de estos casos la extensión del sitio se había ampliado, en 12 sitios se habían realizado mejoras mayores en la administración, en 11 sitios se había detectado financiamiento adicional, en 9 sitios se había fortalecido el régimen legal y en 5, se había evitado que se cumplieran amenazas mayores a su integridad. No obstante, en seis casos (relacionados con 12 sitios) no se habían aplicado medidas de seguimiento sobre las recomendaciones claves hechas por el Comité en el momento de la inscripción.

Los logros durante el proceso de control reactivo de monitoría dieron como resultado ganancias mayores en materia de conservación en 10 casos. En 8 de ellos, se cancelaron o modificaron grandes proyectos de desarrollo que los habrían afectado. En 4 casos el régimen de administración se había fortalecido considerablemente. Las actividades de monitoría no produjeron resultados significativos en otros 10 sitios.

El informe concluye con un pequeño resumen de las lecciones de la Convención de Ramsar y ofrece algunos comentarios de conclusión sobre un número seleccionado de zonas protegidas inscritas en la lista del PM.
"...each generation receives a natural and cultural legacy in trust from previous generations and holds it in trust for future generations. This relationship imposes upon each generation certain planetary obligations to conserve the natural and cultural resource base for future generations and also gives each generation certain planetary rights as beneficiaries of the trust to benefit from the legacy of their ancestors. These planetary obligations and planetary rights form the corpus of a proposed doctrine of intergenerational equity, or justice between generations. For these obligations and rights to be enforceable, they must become part of international law, and of national and subnational legal systems." Edith Brown Weiss, 1989.

1. INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

International conservation conventions are a means to achieve "intergenerational equity" as defined by Weiss in her book: In Fairness to Future Generations: International Law, Common Patrimony, and Intergenerational Equity. At the global level it is assumed that there is added value in applying multilateral legal instruments to assist in strengthening conservation activities at the national level. Indeed, a formidable suite of international conventions relating to conservation has developed over the past 30 years. Surprisingly, however, no empirical assessment has been undertaken on what effect these conventions have had on ensuring maintenance of our common patrimony.

The most-subscribed to of the global conservation governance mechanisms is the World Heritage (WH) Convention (176 State Parties). (The Convention on Biological Diversity has 188 parties but not all these have completed the ratification process.) WH was a product of the Stockholm Conference in 1972, coming into force in 1975 and beginning active work in 1978 with a secretariat located at UNESCO headquarters in Paris. The concept and operation of the Convention is described in various publications and will not be repeated here except to note the following key provisions which form the background to much of what will be discussed in this report:

- The WH Convention covers both cultural and natural heritage. This report deals only with the natural.

- The Convention provides for a modest WH Fund and has considerable associated economic benefits which provides an incentive for having sites inscribed on this prestigious list (sometimes referred to as the "Nobel prize for nature").

- The legal text of the WH Convention is unique among conventions as it authorizes the services of three NGO as advisory bodies to the WH Committee. For natural sites the designated advisory body is IUCN, The World Conservation Union.

Despite having inscribed 167 natural and "mixed" natural and cultural sites on the List since its first meeting in 1978, there has been no comprehensive assessment of how effective the Convention has been in improving the state of conservation of...
sites on the List. A brief itemized list of "success stories" was presented at the WH workshop held at the 4th World Parks Congress in Venezuela in 1992 (Thorsell, 1993) which then was partially updated in an article in the IUCN Bulletin (Thorsell, 2000). No analysis or "lessons learned" were, however, drawn from these summaries.

The objective of this report is to partially remedy this gap in knowledge about how effective the WH Convention has been during the last decade of its operation. Specifically, the objective is to:

- identify, document and analyse situations where the WH Convention, as an international governance regime, has made a positive contribution to conserve biodiversity and enhance protection of individual protected areas. While focusing on achievements the paper will also recognize failures and will focus on the decade since the last World Parks Congress (ie. 1992-2002). It will use Parks Canada’s discussion paper on "Governance Principles for Protected Areas in the 21st Century" as background. Finally it will include observations on any similar experience that has been gained through the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance.

2. CONSERVATION ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

Achievements in using the WH Convention as a governance tool to strengthen conservation of individual sites can be made and measured at two critical points in its operation:

- During the nomination evaluation (preinscription) process;
- As part of the monitoring process which is provided for under the "Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the WH Convention"

The Convention has also been very effective through the provision of technical assistance to sites and assisting with seeking donor funding but this is an operational factor and will only be referred to where relevant in the case studies below.

Of course, conventions are only as strong as the countries that sign them want them to be. The record below provides an indication of the commitment shown by many State Parties to the objectives of this one convention.

2.1 SPECIFIC ACHIEVEMENTS RECORDED DURING THE NOMINATION EVALUATION PHASE

All nominations received annually for natural and "mixed" sites by the WH Centre are referred to IUCN for evaluation. IUCN has developed a rigorous site evaluation process that involves detailed comparison of the global importance of the site using data from the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre, external peer reviewers, field inspections and screening by an annual internal WH Panel. During the past decade, with some 150 nominations presented (of which approximately half were approved), substantial conservation gains were recorded as a result of the evaluation phase for 35 sites. In chronological order these were:
1 Kluane/Wrangell/St. Elias (USA/Canada). The extension of this transboundary site to incorporate Glacier Bay NP (1992) and the Tatshenshini-Alsek PP (1994) not only completed the "St. Elias Mountains" parks complex (10 mil. ha.) but also demonstrated how the WH Convention could be effectively used as a tool to discourage development of a large open pit copper mine proposed in the watershed of the site. The key related legal clause is article 6(3) of the Convention's text which notes that: "each State Party to this Convention undertakes not to take any deliberate measures which might damage directly or indirectly the cultural and natural heritage...situated on the territory of other States Parties to this Convention" (For details see case study by McNamee, 1998).

2 Thung Yai-Huai Kha Khaeng (Thailand). When inscribed in 1992, a strong recommendation was made in the evaluation to carry out community support projects in the buffer zone of the site. With support from WWF the Thai Forest Department subsequently implemented a five-year programme to gain greater local support for the park.

3 Fraser Island (Australia). Statutory protection for all of the island was recommended when inscribed in 1992 and was completed by the State Party in 1998.

4 Shirakami-Sanchi (Japan). Prior to preparing this nomination the local prefecture government decided to suspend construction of a new forestry road through the area and to pursue WH status as an alternative. The recommendation in the 1993 evaluation was to defer a decision until the size could be increased from 10,000 to 17,000 ha, that the legal foundation be improved and that a management planning process be commenced. The authorities acted on all these points and the site was then inscribed. (see Saito, N., 1999)

5 Tubbataha Reef (Philippines). Along with inscription in 1993 was a recommendation that management resources were very inadequate and donor support was urgently required. Under their support to regional WH sites programme, Japan provided substantial funds as did WWF and the training and infrastructure required became available.
6 Central Eastern Rainforest Reserves (Australia). The site was inscribed in 1986 with a recommendation that additional areas merited inclusion but the political climate was not conducive at the time. In 1992 the site was renominated with an increase in size of 30% to 108,000 ha.

7 Halong Bay (Viet Nam). The Committee took a chance when inscribing this site in 1994 as there were serious concerns over definition of an appropriate boundary, almost total lack of management staff and infrastructure, severe tourism impacts and lack of a proper plan. Subsequently, with substantial support from various donors, much effort has been undertaken by the Vietnamese authorities to address these deficiencies and a management regime is now in place (eg. number of staff have increased from less than 5 to 150). The site still faces many problems but without WH designation, the condition of the site would be much worse (see Pham Quang Tho, 1999)

8 Gough Island (UK). When this site was inscribed in 1995 two recommendations were made: (1) the nearby island of Inaccessible be added to the site once a management plan was available; and (2) the marine area around the islands be extended from 3nm to 12nm to allow better controls on commercial fisheries. Both these actions were completed in 2003 resulting in a substantially larger site.

9 Okapi Fauna Reserve (Democratic Republic of Congo). When presented to the WH Bureau in 1995 the decision was deferred due to concern over the total lack of resources (including staff salaries) for management of the site. The following year a private conservation foundation raised sufficient funds to cover all management costs (including local salaries) and with assurances that these were ongoing, the Committee inscribed the site. It is difficult to factor out the influence of WH in obtaining these funds but the promotional literature suggests it added to the justification. Unfortunately, in 1998 the area was caught up in the civil disturbances in the eastern Congo but despite looting and poaching impacts, the foundation maintained a reduced presence in the site.

10 Komi Virgin Forests (Russia). A decision on this site was expected to be a deferral due to concerns over lack of resources to manage the area. Shortly before the final evaluation was prepared for the WH Committee meeting in 1995,
news was received that WWF, with funds (US$2.5 million) from the Swiss Government, was to begin a project to support the park. Partial justification in the project proposal was the pending status of the area as a WHS.

11 Belize Barrier Reef (Belize). After the field evaluation of this site in 1996, a decision to defer the case was made by the WH Bureau based on four issues of concern:

(1) several deficiencies in the boundary including the omission of a key marine feature of the area known as the "Blue Hole";

(2) the lack of completion of the gazettement process for the 7 marine reserves that made up the site;

(3) delays in formal establishment of the Coastal Zone Management (CZM) agency which was to be responsible for the site; and

(4) concern over potential exploratory oil drilling on the reef.

Nine months later, the Belize government responded by:

(1) extending protection to and incorporating the Blue Hole in the site;

(2) giving notice of the completion of the gazettement process;

(3) officially established the CZM agency; and

(4) providing a statement from the Ministry of Energy on the nature, extent and controls applying to any exploratory oil drilling on the reef. Most of these actions would have eventually transpired but the WH nomination process certainly galvanized the Government to speed up their approval.

12 Lake Baikal (Russia). At the time of inscription in 1996 serious concerns were registered over threats to the site: delays in the passage of the new "Baikal Law", pollution, and very restricted resources for management. Although some progress was made in the following two years, including passage of a modified Baikal Law, a follow-up monitoring mission concluded that the site was still under serious threat and WH in Danger listing should be considered. This step was not deemed necessary by the Russian authorities but
the action has succeeded in raising the public profile of the concern of the international community over the issue. Whether this concern is to be translated into concrete conservation action is yet to be demonstrated but prospects for instituting corrective measures are improving. Until then the case of Baikal can be considered a "provisional" success.

13 Kamchatka Volcanoes (Russia). Mining proposals, lack of adequate management resources and lack of protection of an additional important volcano were concerns noted when the site was inscribed in 1996. In 2000 the local government acted to establish a new nature reserve covering 376,000 ha. around the Kluchevskaya Volcano which was then added to the site. Its WH status served as an important factor in attracting significant funds to assist in site management from WWF and the GEF. Prospects for gold mining in the site were affected negatively by policies of several export development agencies which would restrict lending guarantees in projects that would adversely affect WH sites.

14 Laponia area of Sweden. When a 285,000 ha. portion of this area was nominated in 1990, IUCN recommended that the broader values (both natural and cultural) of the adjacent five protected areas should be investigated before proceeding. In 1996, a revised nomination for an area of 940,000 ha. was submitted based on both natural and cultural criteria and was approved. This has led to a more integrated approach to managing the parks in the region and to greater recognition and involvement of the local Sami people. The proposal in the evaluation to invite Norway to consider nominating the adjacent Rago NP to form a transboundary site has also moved forward with this area now included on the Tentative List.

15 Heard and McDonald Islands (Australia). When first nominated for WH status in 1991, a deferral decision was made for four reasons:

1. lack of comparative data to allow the relative importance of this island group in the Southern Ocean to be judged;
2. confirmation of the strength of the legal status over the area;
3. lack of a management plan; and
4. insufficient knowledge of the marine values of the site. In 1997 the State Party re-submitted the nomination noting that the legislation had been
strengthened and a legally binding management plan had been completed. (Adequate data on the marine zone, however, was still lacking.) In the intervening period between deferral and inscription, IUCN conducted a "delphi analysis" of all oceanic islands in insulanta rctica which provided the comparative data needed. The WH nomination process thus facilitated expansion of knowledge about this region as well as providing stimulus to the State Party to strengthen the basis for effective management.

16 Sundarbans (Bangladesh). During the field evaluation of this site in February of 1997, it was noted that only one of three wildlife sanctuaries (71,500 ha.) in the area had been included in the nomination. The nomination was referred back to the State Party with a request to consider extending the scope of the nomination to incorporate a wider range of mangrove ecosystems. Documentation on the two additional areas was compiled and a much larger site (140,000 ha.) then inscribed at the December meeting of the Committee. The site has subsequently received major donor support.

17 Cocos Islands NP (Costa Rica). When inscribed in 1997, it was recommended that the park's marine boundary be extended from 8nm to 15nm. In 2002 the WH Committee approved the State Party's expansion of the marine zone to a distance of 22nm around the island. In view of the illegal fishing in the area, WH status for this zone should assist in addressing this problem.

18 Morne Trois Pitons NP (Dominica). During the evaluation of this nomination, the lack of an approved management plan was identified as an urgent priority. A technical assistance request was soon submitted by the State Party and both this request and the inscription were approved at the December, 1997 meeting of the Committee.
19 Mount Kenya NP (Kenya). This nomination was referred back to the State Party on the basis of findings during the evaluation that suggested there were some serious threats to the site (primarily illegal logging and marijuana cultivation inside the park). The State Party responded with a seven point action plan which included provision of additional vehicles, increased patrols, community awareness projects, training of forest guards and a review of policy affecting the adjacent forest reserve. Based on these assurances, the Committee inscribed the site in 1997 but requested a monitoring mission to measure progress. The site was also granted technical assistance to prepare a new management plan. The monitoring mission took place in 2003 and has reported that many threats still remain but that there was significant progress in management of the site. WH status for Mt. Kenya thus has reinforced the efforts of the Kenya Wildlife Service in slowing the loss of the natural integrity of the park.

20 Lake Turkana Parks (Kenya). When this site was inscribed in 1997, the lack of a management plan was noted as a serious deficiency. The State Party subsequently applied for and was granted technical assistance to prepare a plan. The plan will also incorporate the South Island NP which was added as the third component of the site in 2001.

21 New Zealand Sub-Antarctic Islands (NZ). When this site was listed in 1998, the IUCN evaluation noted the need for more controls over the adjacent marine areas which surround the islands. To achieve this, the State Party has established a 484,000 ha. marine reserve around the Auckland Islands and is considering similar action around other islands in the site.

22 Miguasha Provincial Park (Canada). First nominated in 1993, this nomination was re-submitted in 1998 after an independent comparative study was undertaken on the relative importance of 60 of the world’s Devonian fossil localities. The study confirmed the importance of Miguasha and the site was inscribed.

23 Lorentz NP (Indonesia). Among the many recommendations that accompanied the evaluation and inscription of this site in 1998 was a proposed linkage with a closely related WH site in Australia – the Wet Tropics. In 2001 the AusAID cooperation programme with Indonesia approved a $240,000 (Australian) project to assist in “local government planning and management capacity” which will allow this arrangement to proceed.
24 Puerto Princesa Subterranean River NP (Philippines). The evaluation of this nomination in 1993, which led to a deferral, concluded that the size of the park (5753 ha.) was inadequate and that the legal status was also weak. In 1998 the State Party re-submitted a revised nomination for the new park area of 20,200 ha. which was confirmed by a Presidential Proclamation declaring the legal boundaries. The deferral thus led to five years of planning and resulted in a much more viable park and a sound legal basis.

25 Greater St. Lucia Wetland Park (South Africa). The nomination process here was withheld until a decision was made by the South African Cabinet in 1996 over whether to approve sand mining in the area or to proceed with a conservation regime. When the decision was made not to allow mining, the nomination was submitted and inscribed in 1998.

26 Alejandro von Humboldt NP (Cuba). The decision on inscription of this site in 1999 was to defer. This was based on the evaluation which felt that the size and the legal bases for the park were inadequate. The State Party acted to remedy both these limitations and the site was accepted in 2001.

27 Jau NP (Brazil). The IUCN evaluation for this 2.3 million ha. site, when inscribed in 2000, recommended that two adjacent protected areas also merited study as possible extensions of the site. The State Party has responded with a proposal to more than double the size of the site which will make it one of the largest on the WH List.

28 Kinabalu NP (Malaysia). In the evaluation report, IUCN noted concern over land use encroachment and agricultural pressures around the boundary of the park. The State Party reacted to these concerns by providing a statement for the WH Committee on how these activities were to be carefully regulated.

29 Gunung Mulu NP (Malaysia). A deferral decision by the WH Bureau in 2000 was made in order to seek assurances that protection would be given to several critical areas adjacent to the park. The State Party subsequently informed the WH Committee that the additional areas had been gazetted as extensions to the park and it was then inscribed.

30 Suriname Nature Reserve (Suriname). During the nomination process a project to establish a US$ 15 million trust fund to support the operation of the Reserve was initiated. Part of the justification for raising the funds was its pending status as a WH site. Both parallel actions were approved in 2000.
31 Jungfrau-Aletsch-Beitschorn (Switzerland). During the evaluation process the State Party was encouraged to improve the integrity of the area by initiating a management planning process, establishing a more coordinated management structure and examining potential for extension of the site. Recognising that action on all three of these actions was initiated by the State Party, the site was inscribed in 2001 with a request for a monitoring mission to review progress in two years time.

32 Rift Valley Lakes (Kenya). A deferral decision on this proposed serial site was made by the WH Bureau in 2001 as one of the three components that made up the site was not under an adequate protective regime. Since then the State Party has undertaken to improve the legal basis and has signed a memorandum of understanding with local stakeholders. It is expected that the nomination will be re-submitted in the near future.

33 Cerrado Protected Areas (Brazil). The evaluation process concluded that the original nomination of 236,000 ha. did not provide sufficient coverage of the Cerrado ecoregion and a deferral decision was taken by the WH Bureau. The State Party subsequently reformulated the nomination to include the 132,000 ha. Emas NP which provided a wider range of Cerrado habitats and the two parks were inscribed as a serial site in 2001.

34 Fernando de Noronha and Atoll das Rocas (Brazil). Similar to the Cerrado case, the evaluation process determined that the initial nomination of Fernando de Noronha would be better justified if the Atoll das Rocas could be included. The nomination was amended and the two parks were inscribed as one serial site in 2001.

35 Galapagos Marine Reserve (Ecuador). Although the Galapagos NP has been on the WH List since 1978, it was not until 1993 that the marine reserve surrounding the islands was nominated by the State Party. After the evaluation report underlined for the first time the very serious threats the area was facing the WH Committee’s decision was to defer. For the next eight years until the marine reserve was finally inscribed in 2001, the influence of WH was perhaps more pervasive and effective than experienced in any other site to date. It involved an interplay between the decisions leading up to the nomination process, monitoring missions and timely provision of technical assistance. It also involved a great many actors both internationally and nationally. The case has been recently examined for publication in a new book on Conservation in Galapagos (article by Westbrook D.A. et al. 2003. in press). Without going into details in this paper, a new conservation paradigm for the islands came into being in those intervening eight years. In sum, the new
“Special Law” for Galapagos was passed in 1998, the boundary of the marine reserve was expanded to 133,000 sq. km (the second largest in the world), a collaborative management plan was officially approved in 1999, staff working on marine issues increased from three in 1994 to 75 in 2001, marine research greatly accelerated, and some US $20 million was raised in support of marine reserve management. There still are deficiencies in terms of the lack of passage of the Regulations and weak enforcement of the law but, as noted by Westbrook et. al.: "The Galapagos are widely regarded as a success of the WH system – a troubled site of great significance, where international pressure made a difference....The broad lesson is that matters of global environmental concern, such as conservation in the Galapagos, politics, law, and administration must be understood in both national and international contexts”.

Apart from these 35 cases where progress was indisputably made, there were several others where sites were inscribed but recommendations given in the evaluations have not been acted on by the State Party. The following six examples involving eleven State Parties are cited:

A Beloveshskaya Pushcha/Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland). When inscribed as a transboundary site in 1992 the recommendation was made to remove the fence between the sites to allow wildlife migration across the border and act as a symbol of cooperation. This was never acted on by the State Parties.

B Jiuzhaigou and Huanglong (China). Noting their proximity when inscribed in 1992, the recommendation was made to combine the sites (in two counties) with the intervening land to form one site in the Min Shan. No action on this has been taken.

C Darien and Los Katios NPs (Panama and Colombia). Despite being adjacent and sharing the same ecosystem, the recommendation that the site be considered a transboundary one has not been acted on.

D Iguacu and Iguazu NPs (Brazil and Argentina). Despite being contiguous and sharing the same waterfall, recommendations to consider this as a transboundary site have not been acted on by the State Parties.

E Macquarie Island and New Zealand Sub-Antarctic Islands (Australia and NZ). Despite being part of the same subantarctic island group the recommendation to consider these a single transfrontier site has not been acted on.
2.2 Location of World Heritage Sites mentioned in text

1. Kluane/Wrangell/St. Elias (USA/Canada)
2. Thung Yai-Huai Kha Khaeng (Thailand)
3. Fraser Island (Australia)
4. Shirakami-Sanchi (Japan)
5. Tubbataha Reef (Philippines)
6. Central Eastern Rainforest Reserves (Australia)
7. Halong Bay (Viet Nam)
8. Gough Island (UK)
9. Okapi Fauna Reserve (Democratic Republic of Congo)
10. Komir Virgin Forests (Russia)
11. Belize Barrier Reef (Belize)
12. Lake Baikal (Russia)
13. Kamchatka Volcanoes (Russia)
14. Laponia area of Sweden
15. Heard and McDonald Islands (Australia)
16. Sundarbans (Bangladesh)
17. Cocos Islands NP (Costa Rica)
18. Morne Trois Pitons NP (Dominica)
19. Mount Kenya NP (Kenya)
20. Lake Turkana Parks (Kenya)
21. New Zealand Sub-Antarctic Islands (NZ)
22. Miguasha PP (Canada)
23. Lorentz NP (Indonesia)
24. Puerto Princesa Subterranean River NP (Philippines)
25. Greater St. Lucia Wetland Park (South Africa)
26. Alejandro von Humboldt NP (Cuba)
27. Jau NP (Brazil)
28. Kinabalu NP (Malaysia)
29. Gunung Mulu NP (Malaysia)
30. Suriname Nature Reserve
31. Jungfrau-Aletsch-Bietschhorn
32. Rift Valley Lakes (Kenya)
33. Corrado Protected Areas (F)
34. Fernando de Noronha and
galapagos Marine Reserve.
Sundarbans (India) and Sundarbans (Bangladesh). Despite being contiguous, neither State Party has responded to recommendations regarding the possibility of a single transfrontier site.

It is notable in the cases above that all involve transboundary situations where sovereignty and political issues are paramount over conservation. In summary, the achievements recorded over the past decade during conduct of the WH nomination/evaluation process have been considerable. Obviously, the "leverage" effect (i.e., a deferral) used during the evaluation phase must be based on sound professional analysis and be discussed in close cooperation with the State Party and the WH Committee. This leverage option was not used in any of the six cases where recommended actions have not been taken.

The improvements in detail were:

- In 17 of the cases, recommendations for extensions combined to add millions of hectares to the WH system;
- In 12 of the cases, major improvements to management of the site resulted;
- In 11 sites, substantial additional funding (approximate estimate would be US$40 million) was provided, directly and indirectly related to its WH status;
- In 9 sites, a much strengthened legal regime was put in place; and
- In 5 sites, major threats to integrity were averted.

It can also be stated that, in all the above examples, raising of the public profile of natural heritage conservation at all levels of civil society has occurred and much new knowledge about the values of individual sites has been generated.

### 2.3. Specific Achievements Recorded Through the Monitoring Process.

Being given a place on the WH List is an honor. But, unfortunately, it is no guarantee that the sanctity of the area will be safeguarded. As would be expected in any effective governance system, there is direction given in the Convention text and provision in the Operational Guidelines for monitoring the condition of sites on the List. This is undertaken in two ways: (1) reactive monitoring which is ad hoc reporting by the Advisory Bodies and the WH Centre of threats or significant changes that regularly arise in sites; and (2) periodic reporting which is the process by which State Parties "...are invited to submit to the WH Committee...every six years a periodic report on the application of the WH Convention, including the state of conservation of WH properties located on its territories." (Operational Guideline para.73). Monitoring (or State of Conservation Reporting as it is now more appropriately named) may lead to a site being placed on the List of WH in Danger and even to eventual deletion of a property from the List (although this last step has never been taken despite being suggested for several sites).

Reactive monitoring for natural properties first began at the Committee's meeting in 1983 and a summary of some of the positive results was given at the World Parks Congress in 1992 (Thorsell, 1992). This report will review the record of achievements since then. As periodic reporting by State Parties has only recently been initiated and has not yet fully been applied (only the Arab and African regions have been completed to date), the
record of its results will not be reviewed in this report. Monitoring (or “State of Conservation Reporting” as it is more correctly named) has become a growing concern as it has become apparent that many sites are facing serious threats to their integrity. Over the past decade, threats to the conservation status of almost half of all natural sites have been brought to the attention of the Bureau and Committee. During the last ten years, IUCN has submitted to the WH Centre a total of 260 individual WH site monitoring reports. From 1993-97 these averaged 11 per year rising to 41 per year in 1998-2002. During the same period the number of natural sites on the List of WH in Danger has risen from 7 to 19. With the growing numbers of sites on the WH List and the accelerated range of threats they are subject to, the expanding agenda of WH Committee now is becoming difficult to manage.

Sobering as the news from monitoring is and as difficult as it is to effectively address, the process is essential to “sound governance”. Monitoring underlines the responsibility each State Party faces and is a reminder of the accountability of all signatories to the Convention.

It is, however, more difficult to track the positive effects of monitoring than it is to record achievements during the evaluation phase. By its very nature reactive monitoring is not systematic and, in most cases, results may not be evident for decades or longer. There is no “monitoring and evaluation unit” and a great dependence is placed on the institutional memories of those responsible for compiling reports. And, with 167 natural and mixed sites to cover, much effort is needed to keep up-to-date on conditions in all but the most urgent cases.

Despite these constraints, it is possible, by reviewing State of Conservation reports of the past decade and subsequent interventions by the WH Committee, to compile a “shortlist” of cases where the monitoring process did lead to concrete improvements in the conservation status of WH sites. This report will present ten cases where the monitoring process made a major difference. It will also cite other cases where it has not. It will not list cases where it made a lesser, though not insubstantial, impact, though these are more numerous.

Over the past decade the WH monitoring process has made a distinct difference in at least ten natural sites. It is difficult to factor out the precise value of WH in influencing these achievements as other conditions and other tools were involved, but it is safe to assume that it played a significant role.

The ten sample sites are:

G Redwood NP (USA). A monitoring report given in 1994 noted that a proposed road realignment would negatively affect this park and the Committee sent an expression of concern to the State Party. The State Party replied in 1995 that, following public review of the EIA, the new road construction would be modified to lessen the impact. The role that WH played in this positive decision was not crucial but nevertheless acted to raise the public profile and reinforce concerns already held by the USNPS.
H  Huascaran NP (Peru). In 1998 a monitoring report noted that a large mining consortium was planning to open a copper/zinc mine 20 km. to the east of the park. Transfer of the ore concentrate would be in large trucks through an existing road through the park to the coast. An alternative southern route that would by-pass the park would require costly up-grading if it were to be used. After discussions with the mining company (Antamina) and a mission to the site, the by-pass route was chosen and a "working group" established to monitor impacts. One factor which encouraged the mining company to choose the alternative route is the policy of the export credit agency involved to avoid loans which could result in damage to a WH site.

I  Komi Virgin Forest (Russian Federation). In 1997 a monitoring report noted that the local government proposed adjusting the boundary of this site to permit a gold mining operation. The Russian State Committee for the Environment, however, carried out an inspection which led to cancellation of any mining activity and ordered restoration work to be conducted. Mining in national parks in Russia is illegal in any case but WH status for this area added justification to this decision.

J  Whale Sanctuary of El Vizcaino (Mexico). A proposal for a $120 million expansion of the industrial salt ponds in the lagoons was brought to the attention of the WH Committee in 1996. By 1998 the proposal had become a major public issue with one million protest letters received from the public. Six months after a WHC/IUCN mission to the site and expressions of concerns by the WH Committee, the President of Mexico announced that the project would be cancelled. Responsibilities under the WH Convention were cited in his announcement but public pressure also played a major role in the decision.

K  Ha Long Bay (Viet Nam). The achievements made through the evaluation process in 1994 have been discussed above. Additional improvements to conservation of the site have been since recorded by three monitoring missions. Several serious threats have been deflected, funds raised, a management plan completed, staff trained and facilities improved. Major threats where the WH Committee expressed concern were a proposal for a floating hotel in the Bay (cancelled), construction of a new port affecting shipping lanes (modified) and a new bridge (EIA conducted). Significant management issues remain (over-fishing, regional industrialization, solid waste disposal and tourism impacts) but it is clear that the monitoring process has assisted the State Party in establishing an effective management regime where, only a decade ago, there was none.

L  Skocjan Caves (Slovenia). Many improvements to this site have been made since it was inscribed in 1986 which three monitoring missions have noted and encouraged. First, a regional park act was passed which firmed up the legal basis. Second, the State Party provided $22 million towards pollution controls upstream on the Reka River which flows through the caves. Finally, tourist facilities have been upgraded and the routing of the new Trieste autoroute was adjusted to by-pass the vicinity of the caves. Close liaison with the State Party and the site's WH status have assisted in promoting all these improvements.
M Iguazu NP (Brazil). A monitoring report in 1997 noted that a group of local people had invaded the park and re-opened an 18 km road for protective reasons. Concerned over the impact of this illegal activity and lack of "satisfactory progress" in resolving the issue, the WH Committee sent a mission to the site in 1999 and inscribed it on the List of WH in Danger as a result. The State Party carried out a survey on damage caused and put pressure on the local government to close the road and provided a budget of $560,000 for restoration. A United Nations Foundations (UNF) project for $3 million was also initiated to reinforce integrated management of the broader region of the park (including the Argentinian side). Finally, in June, 2001 the road was closed using the Federal police and army. Rehabilitation activities began and the site was removed from the Danger List. The Ministry of Environment has noted that danger listing was an important tool used in achieving closure of the road.

N Machu Picchu Sanctuary (Peru). This site has been the focus of much attention since 1995 when initial monitoring reports noted the proposed use of helicopters and cable cars for access and plans for expanded hotel development. Three monitoring missions were sent to the site over the next 7 years all containing extensive recommendations for consideration by the State Party. Funds were provided by the WH Committee and by other donors (notably Finland and Japan). The State Party acted on many of these notably preparation of a management plan and withdrawal of the cable car proposal. In sum, the monitoring missions, carried out in close collaboration with the local authorities, have performed an important function in building capacity at the site, obtaining donor support and identifying key problems.
Yellowstone NP (USA). In July, 1995, the WH Bureau received information from a consortium of 14 North American conservation groups that this site was under threat from a proposed mine that would be developed on land adjacent to and upstream of the park. A WHC/IUCN mission to the site was conducted in September, 1995 which underlined the seriousness of the threat as well as noting other management issues the park was facing. The monitoring report then led to the decision to add the park to the danger list at the 1995 meeting of the Committee. Two years later the WH Committee was notified by the State Party that the mining issue had been resolved through a land swap valued at $65 million and that the mine permit had been withdrawn. The park remains on the danger list but discussions have been held on taking it off that list. Although there would likely have been other legal challenges to the mine if it had been approved, WH status of the park and the monitoring mission did help to raise the public profile and did play a role in the final decision.

Galapagos NP and Marine Reserve (Ecuador). As discussed in section 2.1 above, much was achieved in this site through the nomination/evaluation process which began in 1994 when the Marine Reserve was first nominated. For the following seven years monitoring of the conservation situation in the Islands became a major item of debate at the WH Committee meetings. A wide range of actors was involved in this dialogue from the local communities and private sector interests who were intensively involved in a difficult but participatory planning process, to the highest level of at least 5 government ministries in Ecuador. The State Party was particularly keen to avoid the danger list which it viewed as a “black list” rather than as a positive measure to seek corrective actions and garner increased international support. After a process of resolving highly conflicting views, the actions taken by the State Party (particularly the passage of the Special Law for the Galapagos and the completion of the plan for the marine reserve) were recognized as substantial and the future of the islands shifted from an exploitative model to a sustainable one. Threats still, however, remain (eg. illegal shark fishing) but a law, a structure, a plan and more resources are now better placed to address them. The case of the Galapagos is useful in illustrating how all five of the “Principles of Sound Governance” (Institute of Governance/Parks Canada, 2002) can be applied.

The above ten case studies, though not an inclusive list of all the monitoring record, demonstrate how the WH monitoring process can achieve
significant improvements to the conservation status of a site. In summary:

- In eight sites major development projects were either halted or adjusted to reduce impacts on the integrity of the site.
- In four sites the management regime was strengthened through provision of advice and/or resources.
- In all cases the public and political profile of the WH Convention was raised.

But the monitoring process does not always produce significant results. A review of the monitoring reports over the past decade show a number of cases where, despite registering concern, providing funds, sending missions and generating publicity, the conservation status of the site continues to decline or at least does not improve. This is especially the case with six sites that have been caught up in civil disturbances, war and general social unrest. These include two sites in the Albertine rift valley of eastern Democratic Republic of Congo: Virunga and Kahuzi-Biega where reading of the monitoring reports indicates a continual loss of integrity every year despite all the efforts, financial and otherwise, that the WH Committee has made. The same ineffectiveness can be observed for the Aire-Ténéré (Niger), Mont Nimba (Côte D’Ivoire/Guinea), Manas (India), and Manovo-Gounda-St. Floris (Central African Republic). The security situation in all these sites is such that virtually no international mechanism (except perhaps an emergency response force or “green helmet” brigade) could make a difference.

There are several other cases where the situation is perhaps either beyond repair (e.g. irretrievable losses of the natural integrity such as evident in Tunisia’s Ichkeul NP) or cases where the problems are so intractable and complex (Lake Baikal in Russia and Sangay NP in Ecuador), that after years of interventions, very little has transpired to solve the issues. Kakadu NP in Australia also would be another case where intense monitoring efforts over several years did not achieve the desired effect of halting a new uranium mine in an enclave of the park against the wishes of the indigenous owners. (Although several years later the company undertaking the mining put the project to open the new mine on hold primarily for economic reasons.) (For a post-audit of the lessons learned from Kakadu see Hitchcock, 2002).
3. Observations and Experience from the Ramsar Convention

The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitats – the Ramsar Convention (RC), provides another example of an international protected area governance structure. The RC has one important similarity with the WH Convention in that it also has a list of specific sites (currently 1263) and is thus able to operate on a site specific level. There are many sites shared between the two Conventions – 48 WH sites (or a part of them) are also on the RC list.

Ramsar also has a parallel concern with measuring its effectiveness due to the awareness that "...no systematic attempt has been made to measure and track the effect that Ramsar designation has had in terms of increased conservation prospects for Ramsar sites. Although the assumption is that Ramsar designation increases conservation at each site, this hypothesis has not been formally tested." (Castro G. et al. 2002). This concern led to the adoption of a Resolution on "Assessing and reporting the status and trends of wetlands and the implementation of Article 3.2 of the Convention" at the recent Conference of the Contracting Parties held in Spain in 2002.

Despite the lack of any systematic review of the effectiveness of the RC, an initial study by Castro G. et al. did reach a similar conclusion as this report has for WH sites: "The study concludes that the designation of sites to be incorporated in the Ramsar database is likely to have improved the conservation prospects of these sites due to various factors, including increased awareness about the importance of these sites, increased conservation funding (both domestic and international), increased participation by local stakeholders in conservation, and reduction of threats."

Apart from this positive conclusion, in terms of its effectiveness the RC is much more restricted than WH. First, this is because there is no formal independent evaluation procedure of sites that are put forward by the Contracting Party for the Ramsar List. There is a set of criteria that sites are expected to meet but all that is required by the Ramsar Secretariat is that the application form is complete. No "leverage" prospects, so well used in the WH nomination process, are possible with the RC.

The RC also has a monitoring procedure "to detect changes in ecological character" of sites but this must be initiated by the Contracting Party. The WH in Danger List equivalent in the RC is called the "Montreux Record". To date, 76 sites have been entered onto the Montreux Record and 17 have since been removed. With threats to wetland systems well known, it is somewhat surprising that the Contracting Parties have only included 59 of the total of 1263 Ramsar sites on the Montreux Record which in turn could raise questions on the credibility of the monitoring procedure.
4. A NOTE ON ADDITIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

The above discussion has focused on what has been accomplished to strengthen conservation at particular WH sites. There are many other improvements to the workings of the Convention too that should not go without mention. These include the major re-structuring and updating of the Operational Guidelines for the Convention, the increase in staff provided by UNESCO to the WH Centre, and the increased liaison with other conventions.

Worthy of particular mention where WH has made a breakthrough since the 1992 Congress has been in identifying supplementary funding to support WH natural sites in need. The WH Fund itself is modest but has been effectively used in supplying small grants for technical assistance and training. Larger amounts, however, are needed to address larger problems and substantial amounts have been provided through the mechanism of the Global Environment Facility and the United Nations Foundation (UNF). Over the past 4 years a partnership with the UNF and the WH Centre has resulted in a flow of some $30 million to sites in Ecuador, Brazil, Congo and elsewhere. The UNF funds in turn have spawned similar partnership arrangements with several key conservation NGO’s, notably Conservation International, WWF and the Wildlife Conservation Society. WH is obviously an attractive target for donor funds which reflects the confidence that other institutions have that the Convention’s governance principles are sound.

5. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Governance is a concept that extends from the individual to the community, national, regional and ultimately to the global level. The wider the context, the more the actors, the greater is the challenge in designing effective governance mechanisms. In promoting our “planetary obligations”, the WH Convention was one of the first to be developed and has become the most subscribed to of the global conservation conventions. In its work to date WH has demonstrated that, while management of protected areas is clearly a national responsibility, there are clearly some sites where international involvement and accountability is useful and essential.

To conclude, this report does not purport to be an evaluation of the past 30 years of the operation of this Convention. The aim in this paper has been only to record some of the site-specific successes relating to natural sites achieved during the past decade and to identify where WH has had limitations in dealing with conservation issues. From the examples presented above, much has been achieved during both the nomination and reactive monitoring stages.

Annex A provides a table that summarizes the management problem or issues facing the site, the change/improvement that was realized through the operation of the Convention and the relevant governance principle that applied. The governance principles are presented in Annex B.
Beyond effectiveness at the site level, WH also provides lessons for other international conservation instruments. In short, these include:

- The importance of the yellow card/red card system (site in danger, site removed from the List). No other convention has this so well developed;

- The existence of formal advisory bodies which can provide independent scrutiny and evaluation. No other convention has this structure in the text of their conventions.

- The arm's length arrangement that the WH Centre has with UNESCO also helps to facilitate the work of the Convention as does the existence of the relatively small committee (21 members) compared to the total number of State Parties (176).

Workshop discussions at the World Parks Congress in Durban during September, 2003 are planned to further the debate on the effectiveness of this Convention and other governance mechanisms. In turn, the results from Durban should contribute to COP7 of the Convention on Biological Diversity which has protected areas as a major theme in 2004.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>PROBLEM / ISSUE</th>
<th>CHANGE / IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>PROTECTED AREA GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kluane/Wrangell/St. Elias, USA and Canada</td>
<td>Discourage inappropriate use of the land such as a proposed copper mine in the watershed of the site that could damage the cultural and natural heritage of the land.</td>
<td>Extended transboundary site and completed the 'St. Elias Mountains' parks complex</td>
<td>Performance - cost effectiveness, Direction - consistency with international direction, - legislative direction, - demonstration of effective leadership, Accountability - public institutions of accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thung Yai-Huai Kha Khaeng, Thailand</td>
<td>Lack of community involvement in buffer zone.</td>
<td>Implemented a 5-year program to gain greater local support with the support of WWF.</td>
<td>Legitimacy and voice: - participation consensus, - citizen participation, - decentralization in decision making, Direction - existence of management plans for individual protected areas, Performance - responsiveness, - internal evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Island, Australia</td>
<td>Island was not fully protected.</td>
<td>Statutory protection for the whole island completed by 1998.</td>
<td>Legitimacy and Voice - collaborative management for protected areas, Performance - cost effective, - co-ordination, - responsiveness, - risk management, Accountability - role of political leaders, - public institution of accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirakami-Sanchi, Japan</td>
<td>Threat of road construction in a forest.</td>
<td>Pursued WH status and 1993 evaluation to increase the land mass and improve legislation and management.</td>
<td>Legitimacy and Voice - appropriate degree of de-centralization, - citizen participation, Direction - legislative direction, - management plans for individual protected areas, - demonstration of effective leadership, Performance - co-ordination, - policy-learning, - internal evaluations, Accountability - clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubbataha Reef, Philippines</td>
<td>Management of resources was inadequate and donor support was urgently required.</td>
<td>With WH support, Japan and WWF provided funds to improve management.</td>
<td>Legitimacy and Voice - high levels of trust, Performance - internal evaluations, - co-ordination, - capacity improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>PROBLEM / ISSUE</td>
<td>CHANGE / IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>PROTECTED AREA GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Eastern Rainforest Reserves, Australia</td>
<td>Site was inscribed in 1986 but additional areas could not be included due to political climate.</td>
<td>In 1992 the site was re-nominated with an increase in size of 30% to 108,000 ha.</td>
<td>Direction: - existence of system-wide plans - consistency with international direction Legitimacy and Voice: - collaborative management Performance: - capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halong Bay, Vietnam</td>
<td>Concerns over appropriate boundaries, lack of management, infrastructure, and plan, along with negative tourism impacts.</td>
<td>Additional support provided by various donors and increased attention by management authorities to address and resolve these problems.</td>
<td>Direction: - consistency with international direction relevant to protected areas Performance: - responsiveness - internal evaluation Accountability: - clarity - public institutions of accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gough Island, UK</td>
<td>Lack of control over commercial fisheries and marine area.</td>
<td>Marine area and extra site were added resulting in a larger and better-managed site.</td>
<td>Direction: - existence of system wide plans - management plans for individual protected areas Performance: - cost-effective - capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okapi Fauna Reserve (Democratic Republic of Congo)</td>
<td>Complete lack of resources including staff salaries for the management of the site.</td>
<td>Private funds were raised to cover the management costs including local salaries.</td>
<td>Fairness: - equity Legitimacy and voice: - supportive and democratic human rights contexts Performance: - capacity to undertake required functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komi Virgin Forests, Russia</td>
<td>Lack of resources to manage area.</td>
<td>External financial funds came from the Swiss government through the WWF for support.</td>
<td>Performance: - capacity to identify risks and manage them - capacity to undertake required functions - responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize Barrier Reef, Belize</td>
<td>Deficiencies in the boundary of the protected areas, incomplete gazettlement, lack of establishment of CZM agency, and concern for potential exploratory oil drilling in the reef.</td>
<td>Extended protection, completed the gazettlement process, officially established the CZM agency, and policy statement from the ministry on exploratory oil drilling to its minimize impacts.</td>
<td>Direction: - effective leadership - consistency with international direction - legislation direction Performance: - internal evaluation Accountability: - public institutions of accountability Fairness: - fair and impartial enforcement and establishment of protected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>PROBLEM / ISSUE</td>
<td>CHANGE / IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>PROTECTED AREA GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lake Baikal, Russia         | Threats to site such as pollution and limited resource management.               | Public concern of international community over the issue encouraged corrective action to take place. Corrective measures are being implemented and the management situation is improving. | Legitimacy and Voice  
  - citizen participation  
  - civil society groups and independent media  
  Direction  
  - legislative direction  
  - consistency with international direction  
  Performance  
  - policy learning  
  - performance information to the public  
  Accountability  
  - civil society and the media  
  - transparency |
| Kamchatka Volcanoes, Russia | Mining proposal, lack of management resources, and lack of protection for volcanoes. | WH served to attract significant funds from WWF and GEF to establish a nature reserve by local government. | Legitimacy and voice  
  - appropriate degree of decentralization  
  Performance  
  - capacity  
  - risk management  
  - internal evaluation  
  Accountability  
  - clarity |
| Lapponia area of Sweden     | Natural and cultural values were not evaluated together.                         | Broader values were investigated by IUCN, which led to a more integrated approach to managing the parks. | Legitimacy and voice:  
  - participation consensus  
  - collaborative management  
  Direction  
  Consistency  
  Fairness  
  Fairness in the management of protected areas |
| Heard and McDonald Islands, Australia | Lack of plan of management and legislative basis for management of the site was not adequate. | Legislation strengthened; legally binding plan of management completed. | Direction  
  - existence of legislative direction  
  - existence of management plan to set direction |
| Sundarbans, Bangladesh      | Inadequate size to protect the key ecosystem.                                  | WH was catalyst for additional study and re-nomination of a larger area better able to provide protection to the key ecosystem. This improvement in turn, resulted in major donor support being provided. | Performance  
  - capacity to undertake required functions |
| Cocos Islands NP, Costa Rica | Inadequate size to provide needed protection.                                   | Boundary extended to provide stronger protection to an adjacent area; WH status will help improve site management. | Direction  
  - existence of legislative direction  
  Performance  
  - capacity |
| Morne Trois Pitons NP, Dominica | Lack of an approved management plan.                                           | Technical assistance requested by state party-funding provided to prepare a plan of management. | Direction  
  - existence of management plans  
  Performance  
  - responsiveness  
  Accountability  
  - public institutions  
  Fairness |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>PROBLEM / ISSUE</th>
<th>CHANGE / IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>PROTECTED AREA GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Kenya NP, Kenya</td>
<td>Variety of threats identified at the nomination stage such as illegal logging and marijuana cultivation inside the park.</td>
<td>Seven-point action plan to address management issues prepared and implemented. Assistance provided to prepare a new management plan. Threats still exist but are diminishing.</td>
<td>Direction - existence of management plans, Performance - capacity for effective management, Fairness - responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Turkana Parks, Kenya</td>
<td>Lack of management plan.</td>
<td>State party acquired technical assistance to prepare a plan.</td>
<td>Direction - existence of management plans, - existence of system wide plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Sub-Antarctic Islands (NZ)</td>
<td>Need for more management control on the surrounding marine areas.</td>
<td>WH was a catalyst for the State party to establish more control on the surrounding marine area. Similar action may be taken for other islands that are part of the site.</td>
<td>Direction - consistency with international direction, Performance - internal evaluation, Accountability - public institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguasha Provincial Parks, Canada</td>
<td>Lack of comparative data on this site relative to other similar sites.</td>
<td>Comparative study was undertaken on relative importance of the sites resources.</td>
<td>Direction - consistency with international direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorentz NP, Indonesia</td>
<td>Need to establish better management linkage to other similar sites.</td>
<td>WH served to facilitate financial assistance to improve local government planning and management capacity that will enable better linkages to be established.</td>
<td>Performance - financial capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Princesa Subterranean River NP, Phillipines</td>
<td>Size of site was inadequate; legal status was weak.</td>
<td>Legal boundaries of the site reconfirmed; planning undertaken to provide management direction.</td>
<td>Direction - legislative direction, - existence of management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater St. Lucia Wetland Park, South Africa</td>
<td>Decision required by State party on the protected area status of the proposed site. (Land use decision between sand mining or conservation)</td>
<td>Protected areas status confirmed by SA Cabinet which permitted nomination of the site.</td>
<td>Fairness - fairness in the management of protected areas, Direction - demonstration of effective leadership, including by political leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro von Humboldt NP, Cuba</td>
<td>The size and legal basis were inadequate for the inscription of the site in 1999.</td>
<td>State party acted to remedy these limitations, Site was inscribed in 2001.</td>
<td>Direction - legislative direction, Performance - capacity, - risk management, Accountability - public institutions accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jau NP, Brazil</td>
<td>Desirability to extend the site to provide better protection.</td>
<td>State party has responded with a proposal to more than double the current size.</td>
<td>Direction - consistency with international direction, - existence of system wide plans, Performance - responsiveness, Accountability - clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>PROBLEM / ISSUE</td>
<td>CHANGE / IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>PROTECTED AREA GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Kinabalu NP, Malaysia                     | Concern for land use encroachment and agricultural pressure around the boundary of the park. | The state party reacted by notifying the WH that these activities would be carefully regulated. | Direction  
- existence of system wide plans  
- demonstration of effective leadership, including by political leaders  
- Performance  
- responsiveness  
Accountability  
- clarity  
- public institutions of accountability |
| Gunung Mulu NP, Malaysia                  | Protection needed for several critical areas adjacent to the park.               | The additional areas were gazetted as extensions of the park and were inscribed by WH bureau. | Fairness  
- existence of supportive judicial context  
- impartial enforcement and process for protected areas |
| Suriname Nature Reserve, Suriname          | Need funds to support the operation of the reserve.                             | WH served as a catalyst to secure financial assistance to support proper management of the site. | Direction  
- legislative direction  
Performance  
- capacity |
| Jungfrau-Aletsch-Beitschorn, Switzerland   | Need to improve the integrity of the area by initiating a management planning process, establishing a coordinated management structure and studying the feasibility of enlarging the site. | Management planning process initiated, a coordinated management structure implemented and the feasibility of enlarging the site studied. | Direction  
- management plans  
- effective leadership  
Performance  
- capacity  
- co-ordination  
- internal evaluation  
- responsiveness  
Legitimacy and Voice  
- collaborative management |
| Rift Valley Lakes, Kenya                  | Inadequate protective regime in part of the site.                               | Memorandum of understanding with local stakeholders signed to improve management.         | Legitimacy and voice  
- appropriate decentralization  
- collaborative management  
- citizen participation  
Direction  
- legislative direction  
Fairness  
- fairness in the process |
| Cerrado Protected Area, Brazil             | Size of site inadequate to protect the key ecoregion.                           | Size of nominated area increased to provide better protection/representation of ecoregion. | Direction  
- consistency with international direction |
| Fernando de Noronha and Atol das Rocos, Brazil | Size of site inadequate to protect the key resources.                         | Size of nominated area increased to provide better protection/representation               | Direction  
- consistency with international direction |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>PROBLEM / ISSUE</th>
<th>CHANGE / IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>PROTECTED AREA GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galapagos Marine Reserve</td>
<td>Threats to the marine reserve surrounding the islands.</td>
<td>WH process, including the decisions leading up to the nomination process, monitoring missions and timely provision of technical assistance served to strengthen protection, enhance co-operative management and provide financial assistance. One result was the marine reserve being inscribed with a 'special law' involving many international and national actors. The boundary of the marine reserve was also expanded by 133,000sq.km.</td>
<td>Direction: - legislative direction - management plans for individual protected areas Performance - capacity Legitimacy and voice - collaborative management in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beloveshskaya Pushcha/ Bialowieza Forest, Belarus/Poland</td>
<td>Fence between the transboundary site inhibits wildlife migration between the parks and across the national border.</td>
<td>Recommendation to remove the fence to improve natural wildlife movement has yet to be implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiuzhaigou and Huanglong, China</td>
<td>Protected areas are close in proximity and would benefit from a more collaborative management approach, but have not been joined.</td>
<td>Recommendation to combine the sites to improve management has not yet been implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darien and Los Katios NPs, Brazil and Argentina</td>
<td>Shared ecosystem and proximity yet not officially considered a transboundary site, despite recommendation to this effect.</td>
<td>Recommendation to manage these sites as a transboundary site, which would improve management has not yet been implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iguazu NP's, Brazil/Argentina</td>
<td>Location and shared features provide the rationale for managing this area as a transboundary site and a recommendation has been made to this effect.</td>
<td>Recommendation to manage these sites as a transboundary site, which would improve management has not yet been implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie Island and New Zealand Sub-Antarctic Islands, Australia and NZ</td>
<td>Not officially considered a transfrontier site despite location and clear rationale for doing so.</td>
<td>Recommendation to manage this site as a single transfrontier site which would improve management, has not yet been implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundarbans, India/Bangladesh</td>
<td>Despite recommendation, not officially considered a transfrontier site.</td>
<td>Recommendation has not yet been implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX B

FIVE KEY PRINCIPLES OF SOUND GOVERNANCE FOR PROTECTED AREAS, BASED ON THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM'S LIST OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF GOOD GOVERNANCE:

1. LEGITIMACY AND VOICE

◊ Existence of a supportive democratic and human rights context through
   - democratic institutions based on free elections, 'one person one vote', and a viable multi-party system
   - respect for basic human rights including freedom of speech, association, religion
   - lack of discrimination based on gender, race, colour, religion

◊ Appropriate degree of decentralization in decision-making for protected areas; any devolution or divestment is through local bodies that
   - are accountable to local people
   - have the requisite powers and capacity to perform their functions
   - have some constraints, such as minimum environmental standards, to act in the broader national interest

◊ Collaborative management in decision-making for protected areas involving representatives of all affected parties, particularly local and indigenous people

◊ Citizen participation occurring at all levels of decision-making related to protected areas (legislation, system planning, protected area establishment, management planning, operations) with special emphasis at the local level

◊ Existence of civil society groups and an independent media to act as a check and balance on the exercise of the powers granted to protected area political leaders and managers

◊ High levels of trust among the various actors, governmental and non-governmental, national, state and local, involved in the management of protected areas system planning, protected area establishment, management planning, operations) with special emphasis at the local level

2. DIRECTION

◊ Consistency with international direction relevant to protected areas (as appropriate):
   - international conventions – World Heritage Convention; Convention on Biological Diversity, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Significance
   - intergovernmental programs – UNESCO Man and the Biosphere
   - other guidance documents – IUCN/WCPA best practice guidelines

◊ Existence of legislative direction (formal or traditional law) that:
   - sets out a clear purpose and objectives for the protected areas
   - establishes clear authorities relating to means (governance instruments)
   - provides for viable organizations to administer the protected areas
   - includes requirements for citizen participation in decision-making
   - is elaborated in written policy statements
For national protected area systems, existence of system-wide plans that
- have quantified, science-based objectives, e.g. representation, biodiversity conservation, for the full range of protected area management categories
- provide priorities for the planning period
- include provision for citizen participation, particularly local and indigenous people, in their implementation

Existence of management plans for individual protected areas that:
- reflect citizen participation, particularly local and indigenous people
- have formal approval of the appropriate authorities
- set out clear objectives consistent with legislation
- set out measurable results to be achieved within specific timeframes
- are reviewed and updated on a regular cycle (e.g. every five years)
- are implemented through annual work plans

Demonstration of effective leadership –
including political leaders and managers responsible for systems as well as individual protected areas that:
- provides a consistent and stable vision for the long term development of the protected area system or individual protected area
- mobilizes support for this vision
- garners the necessary resources to implement the various plans for the system or individual protected area

3. PERFORMANCE

Cost Effectiveness – Efficiency in achieving objectives: conservation, science, visitor opportunities, local and indigenous communities

Capacity – Capacity to undertake required functions, particularly in regard to its mandate (i.e. conservation, science, visitor opportunities, local needs) and authorities (i.e. regulation and planning, spending, revenue-generation, agreements); its policy capacity and the adequacy and security of its funding

Co-ordination – Ability and capacity to co-ordinate efforts with the principal affected ‘players’ both within and outside government

Policy Learning – The ability to provide for policy learning on the basis of operational experience. There may be significant risks in decoupling policy development from service delivery

Performance Information to the Public –
Provision of sufficient information to facilitate the assessments of performance by governments and the public

Responsiveness – Responsiveness in dealing with complaints and public criticism

Internal Evaluations – Capacity to undertake internal program evaluations and respond to findings

Risk Management – Capacity to identify key risks and manage them
4. **ACCOUNTABILITY**

- **Clarity** — Clarity in the assignment of responsibilities and the authority to act is critical in being able to answer the question "who is accountable to whom for what?"

- **Role of Political leaders** — Appropriateness of responsibilities assigned to political leaders as opposed to non-elected officials or arms length bodies

- **Public Institutions of Accountability** — Effective public institutions of accountability, including access to information, capacity to analyze and report, ability to get action, comprehensiveness of mandates

- **Civil Society and the Media** — Effectiveness of civil society and the media in mobilizing demand for accountability

- **Transparency** — The capacity of citizens, civil society and the media to access information relevant to the performance of protected area management and to its use of regulatory, spending and other powers

5. **FAIRNESS**

- **Existence of a supportive judicial context characterized by respect for the rule of law including:**
  - an independent judiciary
  - equality before the law
  - the requirement for government and its officials to base their actions on well-defined legal authorities
  - citizens having the right to seek legal remedies against the government and against their fellow citizens

- **Fair and impartial enforcement of any protected area rules restricting the use of protected areas including:**
  - the transparency of the rules themselves (their existence is known and accessible)
  - the absence of corruption among public officials
  - the right of appeal for those charged with transgressions

- **Fairness in the process for establishing new protected areas including:**
  - respect for the traditional uses made of the area by local and indigenous peoples
  - their participation in the process of establishing the protected area
  - the appropriate balancing between local uses, conservation objectives and use by visitors

- **Fairness in the management of protected areas including the existence of:**
  - practices that achieve a favourable balance of costs and benefits to local and indigenous peoples (e.g. traditional uses, revenue-sharing, preferential employment and contracting procedures)
  - mechanisms for sharing or devolving the management decision-making of the protected area with local and indigenous people
  - equitable human resource management practices for the staff of the protected area
  - processes for recognizing and dealing with past injustices resulting from the establishment of protected areas
