

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

1. Basic information on the nomination and evaluation mission


1A. Summary information on the nomination

Nominating State Party/ies (and lead



2. Evaluators overview of natural values

3. Mission conclusions relevant to Outstanding Universal Value



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.



management and protection, should be covered under the integrity and protection and management sections above. This section is intended to provide information on the

--

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.

Evaluator comments here.

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.

Evaluator comments here.

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.

Evaluator comments here.

3C7. Adequacy of transboundary management and protection (if applicable)

Evaluator comments here.

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?

Evaluator comments on 3C8a here.

3C8b Are the separate component parts of the nominated property functionally linked in relation to the requirements of the Operational Guidelines?

Evaluator comments on 3C8b here.

3C8c Is there an effective overall management framework for all the component parts of the nominated property?

Evaluator comments on 3C8c here.

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

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:

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

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

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
			regard6(ncer)-4.3(t)-5.9(s)EMC Q 2

those which are not, and provide reasoning. The Heritage Panel will make an eventual decision based on evidence, not only the evaluators report, and is encouraged where relevant. If you wish please indicate your preferred option.

Table 4D. Recommendation on inscription

	Preferred Option
Inscription	
Referral	
Deferral	
Non inscription	

Reasoning for recommendation. Evaluators should provide reasoning for their recommendation on options related to inscription. If a non inscription is recommended please propose key elements for consideration.

Identify the key elements of the property and the sections of the property recommended to the Panel. State the expectations to the Panel regarding the reasoning for recommendation.

Recommendation(s) to improve the nomination to nominating States. Recommendations to improve the nomination should be a priority first.

Recommendation(s) to improve the nomination of the property. Please provide a list of recommendations.

In this section the nominating State should identify the values, that are at risk from the project taking place on the property and/or in the vicinity of the property and how they could contribute to the nomination.

Identify the key issues related to the nomination of the property and the key issues related to the nomination of the property. Please provide a list of key issues.

**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).**

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