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THIS PRESENTATION WILL

• Introduce WH and the nomination process for natural WH sites
• Suggest implications for this workshop
World Heritage Convention:

These sites are the most important and significant natural and cultural areas on earth - and are inscribed under one or more of four natural criteria and six cultural criteria.
World Heritage: as at December, 2019, a global List of 1,121 sites, comprising 869 cultural properties, 213 natural properties, and 39 mixed sites
WORLD HERITAGE IS GUIDED BY OUV

“Outstanding universal value means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole”

Paragraph 49 of the WH Operational Guidelines
The 3 pillars of the concept of Outstanding Universal Value

All pillars must be in place for Outstanding Universal Value to be demonstrated. Operational Guidelines: Paragraphs 77 & 78
Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Operational Guidelines provide the "bible" for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention
Outstanding Universal Value (Ouv) Sites nominated individually or serially can cross the threshold if they meet one or more WH criteria and stringent requirements of integrity.

Relationship of World Heritage Sites to other types of protected areas (PAs) in terms of Outstanding Universal Value versus Representativeness as key determinants.

Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) Potential OUV (T/Lists) Regional Sites and Networks (e.g. Natura 2000, ASEAN Heritage Parks) Sub-Regional Sites (e.g. transboundary PAs, Peace Parks) National Sites/PA Systems (e.g. national parks, nature reserves, private reserves, monuments, NGO designations such as IBAs, ecological networks) Sub-National Sites (e.g. regional parks, provincial and district reserves)

Determinant: Outstanding Universal Value
Sites nominated individually or serially can cross the threshold if they meet one or more WH criteria and stringent requirements of integrity.

Emphasis: Representativeness: ecosystem, landscape, habitat and species conservation through effective PA systems and ecological networks.

Decreasing Global Numbers; Increasing International Recognition
IUCN EVALUATION PROCESS – KEY PRINCIPLES

• The World Heritage List is a select list of sites of outstanding universal value, and the Advisory Bodies should be as rigorous as possible in evaluations (Operational Guidelines)

• Partnership with the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM, and UNEP-WCMC;

• Promotion of World Heritage properties as “flagships” of natural and cultural conservation;

• Use of IUCN and other specialist networks - including with IUCN World Commission for Protected Areas, Species Survival Commission as well as with partners such as the International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS)
Nomination Dossiers from World Heritage Centre

IUCN World Heritage Programme

Exchange of letters with State Party before and after Panel as required. Supplementary information. Meetings if possible. Calls, email frequent.

IUCN World Heritage Panel

Exchange of letters with State Party before mission, including mission, including questions.

External Reviews
(10-20 experts)

Consultation with National and Local Authorities, Local Communities, NGOs, Other Stakeholders

Field Mission
(1-2 experts)

Mission arranged in partnership with State Party.

IUCN Technical Evaluation Report to World Heritage Committee

Nomination Dossiers from World Heritage Centre

Meetings if possible.
Calls, email frequent.
IUCN EVALUATION PROCESS – ASSESSING OUV

• Field evaluation mission in collaboration with the nominating State Party and key stakeholders
• Global comparative analysis to assess global significance - comparing the property with similar properties within the same region is not enough
• Desktop reviews, by global experts/organisations in areas covered in the nomination document
• Use of IUCN WH Thematic Studies, rigorous peer reviewed studies, for thematic areas and for natural criteria
• UNEP-WCMC Comparative Analysis for all nominated sites
Case study: Papahānaumokuākea (United States of America)

**Figure 3.5: Comparison of World Heritage Site reef fish endemism rates**  
(Source: PMNM)
IUCN EVALUATION PROCESS – ASSESSING INTEGRITY

• Field Missions play a key role
• Assessment of boundaries, are they adequate and large enough to protect proposed OUV.
• What are the threats and impact on OUV, are they identified and managed
• Justification for Serial or Transboundary proposals
CORAL REEFS OF NEW CALEDONIA
Biens, Zones Tampons Marines, Zones Tampons Terrestres

Inscription du récif néo-calédonien au patrimoine mondial de l'UNESCO

Légende
- Zones inscrites
- Zones tampons marines
- Zones tampons terrestres

Récifs d'Entrecasteaux

Grand Lagon Nord

Zone Cotière Nord-Est

Ouvéa et Beaupré

Zone Cotière Ouest

Grand Lagon Sud

Zones inscrites

0 25 50 100 150 Kilomètres
THREATS NEED TO BE ASSESSED

Such as tourism and loss of marine biodiversity from destructive fisheries practices and coral bleaching.
Growth in International Travel

- South Asia: 1,600 (Actual), 1,600 (Forecast)
- Middle East: 1,400 (Actual), 1,400 (Forecast)
- Africa: 1,200 (Actual), 1,200 (Forecast)
- East Asia/Pacific: 1,000 (Actual), 1,000 (Forecast)
- Americas: 800 (Actual), 800 (Forecast)
- Europe: 600 (Actual), 600 (Forecast)

Source: UNWTO
IUCN EVALUATION PROCESS – ASSESSING PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS

• Field Missions play a key role
• Level of protection status
• Management authority and Management Plan
• Buffer zone protection in surrounding area
Sichuan Giant Panda Sanctuaries (China)
10 IMPLICATIONS FOR US PACIFIC TERRITORIES AND WORLD HERITAGE

• (1) The process is rigorous and extensive. Excellent preparation is required.

• (2) Essential to document proposed OUV, by comparison with existing WH sites in the Pacific and globally. It is important to note there are already some very large marine WH sites in the Pacific.

• (3) Focus on globally significant features such as, for example, hydrothermal vents in the Marianas trench Marine National Monument.
10 IMPLICATIONS FOR US PACIFIC TERRITORIES AND WORLD HERITAGE

• (4) Ensure conditions of integrity are met
• (5) Ensure protection/management conditions are met
• (6) Consider options for Serial WH properties e.g. may potentially be relevant for Pacific Remote Island Marine national Monument
10 IMPLICATIONS FOR US PACIFIC TERRITORIES AND WORLD HERITAGE

(7) Nominations from US Pacific Territories will need to be put forward by the State Party (US) and thus must be an integral part of the US World Heritage nomination process and priorities.

(8) Compact of Free Association countries (RMI, FSM) can and have put forward their own WH nominations.
10 IMPLICATIONS FOR US PACIFIC TERRITORIES AND WORLD HERITAGE

• (9) Consider opportunities for Mixed (Natural and Cultural) nominations, given the close nature/culture links in the Pacific
• (10) Learn from other examples, such as Rock Islands in Palau, what worked, and what didn’t work for their nominations, and subsequent inscription
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