

**ENHANCING OUR HERITAGE PROJECT**  
(With support from UNESCO and IUCN)

**LAKE MALAWI NATIONAL PARK NATURAL WORLD HERITAGE SITE**

**Implemented Under the Mentorship of**  
**Kagosi Mwamulowe**

**April 2013**

## MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS

### Initial Assessment Report for Lake Malawi National Park World Heritage Property, Malawi

## 1 1. INTRODUCTION

Lake Malawi National Park was established by the Government of Malawi in 1980 as the first freshwater, underwater national park in the world and is located at the Southern end of Lake Malawi,. **The primary reason was to preserve a sample of the Lake Malawi biome.** With reference to small brightly coloured rocky-shore tilapine cichlids locally known as *mbuna* . Lake Malawi National Park is of global importance for biodiversity conservation due particularly to its fish diversity. The park is considered to be a separate bio-geographical province with estimates of up to 1000 fish species half occurring nowhere else in the world. Very high endemism. All but 5 of over 350 species are endemic. Some species consist of small populations restricted to single islands or rocky promontories. The first and only freshwater national park designated as World Heritage site in 1984.



The park is sufficiently large (94.1 km<sup>2</sup> ) to adequately represent the water features and processes important for long term conservation of the lake's rich biodiversity and exceptional natural beauty. The park consists of 13 islands, several disjuncture mainland portions of Cape Maclear Peninsula, Nkhudzi hills and spit. And waters within 100m of the shoreline of these terrestrial components.

About 25, 000 people live in the five enclaves of Chembe, Msaka, Mvunguti, Zambo and Chizale. While Sumbi, Kasankha and Mwanyama are group village headmen adjacent to park

boundaries. Fishing, natural resources collection and subsistence farming makes a living for these people.

Lake Malawi National Park was selected as one of the 10 pilot sites at which the UNESCO's 'Enhancing our Heritage' project was to be implemented to enhance effective management, monitoring and reporting on the resources therein under the new Africa Nature Programme.

### **Brief Synthesis**

Lake Malawi is globally important for biodiversity conservation due to its outstanding diversity of freshwater fisheries. The Lake is a separate bio-geographical province whose fish diversity exists nowhere else in the world. As a result Malawi in 1980 created a fresh water National Park within the southern part of the lake. The park, the first of its kind in the world, inhabits a fascinating and diverse rock-dwelling cichlid locally known as "*mbuna*"; and it has spectacular rugged landscapes in the background fusing in with remarkably clear waters creating exceptionally scenic beauty. The *mbuna* fishes display a significant example of biological evolution. Due to its isolated nature the fishes have over the years developed impressive adaptive radiation and speciation.

### **Criteria**

**Criteria** (vii) *Areas of exceptional Natural Beauty and aesthetic importance:* The park is an area of exceptional natural beauty. Its setting in the background of the Great African Rift Valley Escarpment with spectacular rugged landscapes and its islands that fuse in with remarkably clear waters creates scenic outlook of exceptional quality.

**Criteria** (ix) *Representing significant on-going ecological and biological process:*

The park has significant examples of biological evolution. There is impressive radiation and speciation within the lake. The lake cichlids are of great value to science just as the Darwin's finches of the Galapagos Islands and the honey creepers of Hawaii. The adaptive radiation and speciation is noteworthy particularly in the family of Cichlids locally known as *mbuna*. All but five of over 400 species of *mbuna* are endemic to Lake Malawi and represented in the park.

**Criteria** (x) *Contains the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity:* Lake Malawi is globally important for biodiversity conservation due to its outstanding diversity of its fresh water fishes. The lake is a separate bio-geographical province whose fish diversity exists nowhere else in the world. It has more than 1000 species but only 500 from 10 families have been described with 90% endemic to the lake and half of the species occur within the park. This is the largest number of fish species of any lake in the world. Of particular significance are the cichlids of which all but 5 of over 400 species are endemic representing 99% endemism. The lake contains 30% of all known cichlid species in the world.

## **Integrity**

The park is fairly large (94.1km<sup>2</sup> of which 7 km<sup>2</sup> is aquatic zone) to adequately represent all the water features and processes that are of importance for long term conservation of the lake's rich biodiversity and exceptional natural beauty. The water area protected within the park protects the most important elements of the lake's biodiversity. The park protects all major underwater vegetation types and important breeding sites for the cichlids. However the property's long term integrity totally depends on the overall conservation and management of the lake which falls under the jurisdiction of three sovereign states i.e. Malawi, Tanzania and Mozambique.

## **Requirements for Management**

Lake Malawi National Park (LMNP) is managed under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. Under this Act, the resources of the park are managed and controlled by the Department of National Parks and Wildlife. As a protected area, utilisation of park resources is restricted and sustainable management measures have been instituted to curb the illegal harvesting of resources. This is being strengthened by the Wildlife Policy that promotes collaborative management and private sector involvement.

There are five enclave villages inside the park whose areas are not part of the park. However, park authorities work with these communities through the collaborative management programme.

The Wildlife Policy mandates park management to work in collaboration with local communities within and outside park boundaries and share responsibilities and benefits accruing from the management of the park. The park has a management plan which stipulates the management and implementation strategies inline with the policy of the Department. Besides that, there is also a strategic tourism management plan for Malawi which also describes the tourism development for the site.

Whilst the property's terrestrial and underwater habitats are still in good condition, management planning needs to deal more with current threats of rapid growth of human population in the enclave villages resulting in massive firewood collection, fish poaching and crowded fish landing sites. Continued existence of these threats will negatively affect the significance of the property as a world heritage site.

## 2. WORKSHOP FRAMEWORK AND OUTPUTS

<p>Workshop objectives</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To share knowledge on Africa Nature Programme (Enhancing Our Heritage) EOH Tool with stakeholders</li> <li>2. To implement the EOH Tool (fill in 12 Questionnaires) as Site Managers and stakeholders</li> <li>3. To build capacity in the Site Managers on the implementation of EOH</li> <li>4. To draw lessons for future implementation of the programme within the Site and at other World Heritage Sites</li> <li>5. Develop a network with stakeholders</li> </ol>
<p>Dates</p>	<p>23rd -26th April 2013</p>
<p>Mentor</p>	<p>Kagosi Mwamulowe, Director, East Central Region, National Heritage Conservation Commission, Box 320013, Lusaka Zambia Email : <a href="mailto:mwamsk@yahoo.com">mwamsk@yahoo.com</a>; <a href="mailto:mwamsprog@gmail.com">mwamsprog@gmail.com</a>; <a href="mailto:mwamulowek@netscape.net">mwamulowek@netscape.net</a></p>
<p>Site Manager</p>	<p>Bryson Banda</p>
<p>Participants</p>	<p>21 participants including :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mentor and Site Manager</li> <li>National Park</li> <li>Police</li> <li>Court</li> <li>Tourism operators</li> <li>Fisheries Department</li> <li>Media</li> <li>Conservation NGO</li> <li>Ministry of Education</li> </ul>
<p>Methodology used</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Powerpoint presentations in plenary on the programme, tool and OUVs</li> <li>2. Field Trip to one island for participants to appreciate the</li> </ol>

	<p>OUVs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Question and Answer sessions</li> <li>4. Hand outs were presented in folders</li> <li>5. Participants were also given field notebooks for taking notes</li> <li>6. Three working groups were created and blank tool worksheets in print and electronically distributed amongst the 3 groups for the participants to fill in the worksheets.</li> <li>7. The Mentor and Site Manager were involved in guiding the meeting and answering some of the questions</li> <li>8. Due to inadequate time the groups were only allowed a few minutes to present a few components of their group work</li> <li>9. On the third day a select group was chosen to try and cleanup the worksheets</li> </ol>
<p>Level of participation</p>	<p>The participation was level in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. literacy levels was good considering that some participants had Masters degrees and were heads of departments e.g. the Deputy Director,for Malawi National Park and the Fisheries official,</li> <li>b. position in society were heads of departments e.g. the Deputy Director,for Malawi National Park and the Fisheries official, Magistrate, Park Extension</li> <li>c. contibution during workshop plenary and group deliberations was highly interactive and participatory</li> <li>d. government commitment, was good considering that the workshop was attended by the Deputy Director of Malawi National Park based in Lilongwe who officially opened and closed the meeting and also most of the heads of departments</li> <li>e. gender representation was not very good as only ladies were present but were making positive contributions during the discussions</li> <li>f. stakeholder invilvement was very high both in attendance</li> </ol>

	and contributions
Identified opportunities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The workshop was a good opportunity for networking between park managers and external stakeholders. Stakeholders encouraged this to continue. The other level of networking is at international level</li> <li>2. The Stakeholders appreciated the OUVs and the role being played by IUCN and UNESCO in the management of Protected Areas</li> <li>3. The field trip exposed illegal tour guiding and associated activities such making of fire and brying of fish and feeding fish will bread. An on the spot awareness was made on both the guides and tourists and fees collected from them . This confirmed the numerous management challenges experienced at the site.</li> <li>4. The Mentor was also interviewed on the objectives of the workshop by the Community Radio which was setup using sponsorship from UNESCO</li> <li>5. The Mentor had an opportunity of sharing some of the challanges with the Director and Deputy Director of National Parks on the challenges faced by World Heritage Center and the Committee on the management of the World Heritage Properities and the effective implimentation of the World Heritage Convention arising from incosistences in employing/transferring of Site Managers</li> <li>6. The workshop also revealed the presence of Missionary Graves for Dr David Livingstone’s associates. David Livingstone is the European explorer who sighted the Victoria Falls (now a World Heritage Site) and Lake Nyasa (now Lake Malawi) part of which is a nominated World Heritage Site. The Graves are inside the park (WHS). The Victoria Falls world heritage site has European Missionary graves world war memorial. Both sites have an igneous rock formation and aquatic formations and processes used a processes Nomination Criterion except one is ecological and geological. The mentor saw an opportunity for twinning the two sites for information sharing.</li> <li>7. The workshop also revealed a number of opportunities for research, strengthening of law enforcement by the police and courts of law, management upscaling on monitoring, improvement of management plan</li> <li>8. The workshop provided an opportunity for Zambia to look into the possibility of considering the Lake Tanganyika portion in Zambia for consideration as World Heritage Site including the Nyika Plateau area nomination which Malawi is already on.</li> <li>9. The workshop saw the need to have an official management plan for the World Heritage Site</li> <li>10. The Management provided accommodation to the Mentor for the 3 nights he was at the Site</li> </ol>

# **LAKE MALAWI WORLD HERITAGE**

## **EOH TOOL OUTPUTS**

**2013**



## 2 Worksheet 1a: Identifying major site values and objectives

Value subheadings	Major site values	Is this a World Heritage value? (list World Heritage criteria numbers)	Information sources used for determining the values
Values can be broken down into subgroups as suggested below. Some assessments can be carried out using these groupings.	List major values here. There are many specific values present in WH sites. It is not possible to manage each value separately so there is a need to group these into a few <b>major values</b> that can help focus management efforts (see examples in the guidance notes).	Note if a particular value is also officially recognised in the WH nomination document and identifies the relevant WH criterion. There are ten criteria in the WH Operational Guidelines that are used as a basis for WH listing. WH properties will be listed on the basis of one or more of these criteria.	List all information sources such as the park gazettal notice, WH nomination document, park management plan, research reports etc. used in identifying major values.
<b>Biodiversity Values</b>		x	Nomination dossier, science pub,
	Diverse fish species	ix	Nomination dossier, science pub,
	Habitat	x	Nomination dossier, science pub,
<b>Other Natural Values</b>	Aesthetic beauty of landscape sceneries	vii	Nomination dossier, science pub,
		No	NM Gazette
	Gastropods Endemism	No (?)	Science pub,

Value subheadings	Major site values	Is this a World Heritage value? (list World Heritage criteria numbers)	Information sources used for determining the values
Cultural Values	Historical sites (Graves & David)	No	Master plan, Gazzette, PMP, IK
		No	"
			"
Economic Values	Tourism	No	PMP, Str Tourism Mgt Plan Mlw
	Resource use values		
	Fish Breeding Area	No	As above
	Potential Donor funding	No	
	Employment	No	
Educational Values	Research & scie values (Tertiary)	ix	Nomination dossier, science pub,

Value subheadings	Major site values	Is this a World Heritage value? (list World Heritage criteria numbers)	Information sources used for determining the values
	Primary and Secondary education	No	PMP
	Community Awareness	No	PMP
Other Social Values	Recreation	No	PMP, Tourism Plan

Analysis and conclusions	The site has very rich and diverse values deserving serious research and protection
Comparison with previous assessment	N/A
Gaps and challenges	Some of the fish species have not been taxonomically described. Some of the resources have potential OUVs. The population dynamics of the endemic species have not been
Opportunities, recommendations, follow-up action	Research and education, Funding, income generation and employment Consider the recommendations on requirement for protection as stated in the SOUV for the Site

## 4 Worksheet 1b: Documenting management objectives and their relationship to site values

	Principal objectives	Major values linked to these	Information sources used for determining the objectives
	List Principal Management Objectives (from park management plan or other source documents) grouped according to the major values that they relate to.	Identify major values that are related to this objective (there may be more than one value related to a principal management objective)	Give the source of the particular objective (e.g. management plan, work plan etc)
Biodiversity values	Preserve sample of Lake Malawi Biome (Rocky Cichlids)		Nomination dossier, science pub, mtg plan
	Preserve biodiversity	Diverse fish species	As above
Other natural values	Protect aesthetic values of the park	Habitat	As above
Cultural values	Protect the historical sites	Tourism value	Mgt and Tourism Plans

	<b>Principal objectives</b>	<b>Major values linked to these</b>	<b>Information sources used for determining the objectives</b>
	List Principal Management Objectives (from park management plan or other source documents) grouped according to the major values that they relate to.	Identify major values that are related to this objective (there may be more than one value related to a principal management objective)	Give the source of the particular objective (e.g. management plan, work plan etc)
<b>Economic values</b>	<b>To develop tourism industry</b>	<b>Tourism value</b>	<b>Mgt Plan</b>
<b>Educational values</b>	<b>Promote Research &amp; scientific studies.</b>	<b>Endemism, evolution, adaptive radiation and speciation of the fish species</b>	<b>PMP, Publications</b>
	<b>Promote Primary and Secondary education</b>	<b>Environmental education</b>	<b>PMP</b>
<b>Other social values</b>	<b>Promote sustainable Recreation activities</b>	<b>Aesthetic beauty</b>	<b>SOUV, Tourism Plan</b>

	<b>Principal objectives</b>	<b>Major values linked to these</b>	<b>Information sources used for determining the objectives</b>
	List Principal Management Objectives (from park management plan or other source documents) grouped according to the major values that they relate to.	Identify major values that are related to this objective (there may be more than one value related to a principal management objective)	Give the source of the particular objective (e.g. management plan, work plan etc)

<b>Analysis and conclusions</b>	<i>The Mgt objectives are inadequate to deal with the values that the site has thereby delinking the mgt plan objectives from the actual activities on the ground</i>
<b>Comparison with previous assessment</b>	
<b>Gaps and challenges</b>	<i>The Site does not have WHS specific mgt plan</i>
<b>Opportunities, recommendations, follow-up action</b>	<i>Prepare a WHS specific mgt plan</i>

## Worksheet 2: Identifying Threats

List Threats	List values threatened	Current or Potential Threat?	4.1.1.1.1 Identify major causes of threat	5 Impact of threat		6 Management response		7 Data source
				Extent	Severity	Action	Urgency of action	
List all important threats	List any of the values of the site affected by the particular threat	Distinguish between current threats already taking place and potential threats that are known but have not yet happened	List activities which are causing or contributing to the threat. Each threat has at least one, and may have several, causes.	Describe the extent of the impact, e.g. area, habitat type, cultural value (rate as low; medium; high or very high)	Describe how severe the impact of the threat is on the value (rate as low; medium; high or very high)	Describe what actions are planned or have taken place to manage the threat	Estimate and/or rate as low; medium, high or very high the urgency of action needed	Record whether the assessment has been made through expert workshop or from using the results of monitoring or research etc.

7.1.1.1	7.1.1.2	<i>Tick boxes for</i>	1.					
		<i>Current</i>						
		<i>Potential</i>	2.					
<b>Enclave villages</b>	<b>Terrestrial and aquatic habitat</b>	<i>Current (Pop)</i>		<b>High</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Increase Staffing levels, Law enforcement, collaborative mgt agreements, awareness programmes, Designed research and monitoring of resource extraction</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Results of research monitoring and Stakeholder workshop</b>
		<i>Potential (pop growth)</i>	1. <b>overexploitation</b>					
			2. <b>as above</b>					



<b>Illegal harvesting of resource (vegetation loss)</b>	<b>Aesthetic values</b>	<i>Current</i>	<b>1.</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Ticket permit Resource collection mgt system, Law enforcement, collaborative mgt agreements, awareness programmes, Staff recruitment/ trainings</b>	<b>high</b>	<b>Research Reports</b>
---	-------------------------	----------------	-----------	---------------	---------------	--	-------------	-------------------------

		<i>Potential</i>	2. deforestation	High	High	Ticket permit Resource collection mgt system, Law enforcement, collaborative mgt agreements, awareness programmes, Staff recruitment/ trainings	high	Stakeholder workshop  Field reports
<b>Climate Change</b>	<b>Endemism And biodiversit y of fish</b>	Current	1					
		Potential	2					

<b>Comments/explanation</b>	Threats to the WHS are high. However not directly linked to OUV since activities taking place outside 100 metres zone.
<b>Analysis and conclusions</b>	Most of the assessment is not empirically tested
<b>Comparison with last assessment</b>	N/a
<b>Gaps and challenges</b>	Species trend analysis is not done
<b>Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions</b>	Recommend for more research studies

## Worksheet 3: Engagement of Stakeholders

	Identify major stakeholders with an interest/connection with the site	Issues to assess	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Comments/Explanation
			ACADEMIC/SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY	PRIVATE SECTORS	PUBLIC SECTORS	LOCAL COMMUNITY	
Understanding Stakeholders	7.1.2 List the main issues affecting either the stakeholder group or the site.	Main issues associated with this stakeholder	Knowledge/education purposes	Economic purpose	conservation	Conservation	There potential for conservation and economic empowerment
	7.1.3 How, and to what extent are stakeholder groups dependent on the site value(s) for economic or other benefits?	Dependency of stakeholders on site	Access to education/research facilities,	Earning a living through guiding activities	Indirect	Domestic use	There is direct and indirect benefit from the site

	Identify major stakeholders with an interest/connection with the site	Issues to assess	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Comments/Explanation
			ACADEMIC/SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY	PRIVATE SECTORS	PUBLIC SECTORS	LOCAL COMMUNITY	
	What is the nature and extent of any negative physical impacts on the site value(s)? For example, do stakeholders still extract resources from the site such as timber? Note whether these are legal or illegal?	List negative impacts of stakeholders on site	Unregulated Specimen collections (no thresholds)	Some failing to pay park entry fees	Failure to establish community woodlots leads to pressure on site	Fresh tree cuttings, Illegal firewood collection, fishing Encroachment	
	7.1.4 What are the negative impacts of the World Heritage site on the stakeholders? For example: were the communities displaced when the site was declared; are they excluded from traditional hunting grounds?	List negative impacts of site management on stakeholders	Site management regulation are prohibitive	Failure to meet with stakeholders on formal agreements	none	Prohibition of fishing within 100m zone, control measures on resource collection	

	Identify major stakeholders with an interest/connection with the site	Issues to assess	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Comments/Explanation
			ACADEMIC/SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY	PRIVATE SECTORS	PUBLIC SECTORS	LOCAL COMMUNITY	
	What is the nature and extent of any positive impacts of the stakeholder group on the site value(s)? For example, do local tourism guides alert rangers to problems? Does surrounding land use provide connectivity for the site?	List positive impacts of stakeholders on site	Publications and education information about the site	Marketing the site, through good interpretation, diversifying tourism product	Collaboration on community mobilisation	Co - management	

	Identify major stakeholders with an interest/connection with the site	Issues to assess	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Comments/Explanation
			ACADEMIC/SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY	PRIVATE SECTORS	PUBLIC SECTORS	LOCAL COMMUNITY	
	<p>7.1.5 What are any direct positive benefits of the site to the stakeholder group? For example does the site provide employment opportunities for local people? Does a forested area provide catchment protection and improved water quality for local people? Do tourism ventures benefit from the site values?</p>	List positive impacts of site management on stakeholders	Provision of educational/research resources for studies	Earning a living and job creation	collabolation	Co - management	
	<p>What is the stakeholder group's receptivity to participating in management of the site value(s)? Under what terms or conditions?</p>	Willingness/capacity of stakeholders to engage with site management	Very willing	Very willing	Very willing	Very willing	

	Identify major stakeholders with an interest/connection with the site	Issues to assess	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Comments/Explanation
			ACADEMIC/SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY	PRIVATE SECTORS	PUBLIC SECTORS	LOCAL COMMUNITY	
	What is site management's relationship with the stakeholder group? What is the capacity (including resources) for engaging?	Willingness/capacity of site management to engage with stakeholders	Very willing	Very willing to enter into agreements	Very willing	Very willing	
	7.1.6 What is the stakeholder group's relative political or cultural leverage or influence in the site value(s)?	Political/Social influence	Raised global profile of the site	Socially assisting tournaments	None	Culturally there is a strong sense of ownership	



	Identify major stakeholders with an interest/connection with the site	Issues to assess	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Comments/Explanation
			ACADEMIC/SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY	PRIVATE SECTORS	PUBLIC SECTORS	LOCAL COMMUNITY	
	7.1.7 How and to what degree is the stakeholder group organised, such that their engagement in management may be efficient and effective? Are there any specific community institutions that facilitate engagement?	Organisation of stakeholders	Presence of Research facilities and involvement of/interaction amongst research and academic institutions	Registered association	Government department	Traditional authorities structures	

	Identify major stakeholders with an interest/connection with the site	Issues to assess	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Comments/Explanation
			ACADEMIC/SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY	PRIVATE SECTORS	PUBLIC SECTORS	LOCAL COMMUNITY	
Assessment of Stakeholder Engagement	7.1.8 Describe the nature and extent to which the stakeholder group contributes to decision-making in relation to this particular site value(s).  Are there formal or informal management agreements in place?	What opportunities do stakeholders have to contribute to management?	There are formal agreements  Stakeholder research findings contribute to site management	Promoting marketing, income generation	Promotion of conservation	Co-management	

	Identify major stakeholders with an interest/connection with the site	Issues to assess	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Comments/Explanation
			ACADEMIC/SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY	PRIVATE SECTORS	PUBLIC SECTORS	LOCAL COMMUNITY	
	7.1.9 Describe the actual engagement of the stakeholder group in the management of the specific value(s). Are stakeholders regularly consulted regarding management of this value? Where possible, provide details of the nature and extent of engagement.	What is the level of engagement of the stakeholder?	Conduct research as input to mgnt planning process.	Park and national level	National level	District level, TA level, GVH level, VH level	
Summary	Based on the information above, provide a brief description of the overall picture of stakeholder engagement.	Describe the <u>overall</u> adequacy of stakeholder engagement	Regularly conduct the research as reflected in their publication	Registered association responsible for tourism	Government department responsible for conservation	Participation on benefits (both legal and illegal) accrued from mgt of pa	

	Identify major stakeholders with an interest/connection with the site	Issues to assess	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Name of stakeholder group	Comments/Explanation
			ACADEMIC/SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY	PRIVATE SECTORS	PUBLIC SECTORS	LOCAL COMMUNITY	
<b>Rating</b>	<p><b>Very good</b> - more than 75% of aspects of the relationship are positive</p> <p><b>Good</b> - 51 to 74% of the aspects of the relationship are positive</p> <p><b>Fair</b> - 26 to 50% of aspects of the relationship are positive</p> <p><b>Poor</b> - 25% or less of the aspects of the relationship are negative</p>	Rate the <u>overall</u> adequacy of stakeholder engagement, as either very good; good; fair or poor	Good	good	good	good	There is good relationship with stakeholders

<b>Analysis and conclusions</b>	The site has a good number of stakeholders that assist in the management.
<b>Comparison with last assessment</b>	None
<b>Gaps and challenges</b>	<p>Influx of tourism activities.</p> <p>Population increase.</p>

**Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions**

There is room for more stakeholder interaction.

## Worksheet 4: Review of National Policy Context

Policy areas	Policy name/description	Strengths	Weaknesses	Comments/explanation
	Describe the specific legislation/policy/treaties or conventions for the site	Record how the policy supports management of the site values/ objectives	Record how the policy can impede management of the site values/ objectives	
World Heritage Site and protected area legislation	National parks and wildlife act, and wildlife policy 2000	Provides stakeholders participation in management  Legal backing	Low enforcement of the policy	They take time to be reviewed
Conservation within broader government policy	NEP, forest policy, fisheries policy	Provides guidelines for conservation	Poor policy interpretation	Conflicts of policies on the use of the site
International conservation conventions and treaties	UNESCO, IUCN, CITES	Provide global support on capacity building	Limitation in selection criteria	Guideline to source funds should be clearly known
Government support for the World Heritage site	National parks and wildlife act, wildlife	It has legal backing for protection and	Inadequate review	Need for review of national park act and

	policy 2000	conservation of wildlife resources		wildlife policy
Management authority and the World Heritage site	PMP,tourism strategic management plan	Provides day today guidelines for management operation	They are drafted documents	The drafted documents need to be reviewed and get signed
Legislation/policy affecting community participation in site management and sharing of benefits	Wildlife policy 2000 and national park policy	It has legal backing for protection and conservation of wildlife resources	Inadequate review	Need for rviewal of national park act and wildlife policy
Add additional criteria here	WHS nomination dossier	International recognition	Not known by most stakeholders	Not known by communities
Add additional criteria here				

Analysis and conclusions	
--------------------------	--

	The site has got valid documents to support the management of the site
Comparison with last assessment	Not applicable
Gaps and challenges	Most of the documents have taken time to be reviewed and they are not known to stakeholders
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions	Room for stakeholders sensitisation



## Worksheet 5a: Management Planning Information Sheet

Name of plan	Level of approval (L,G,A, SA,D)*	Year of preparation, or most recent review	Year specified for next review	Comments/Explanation
	See key below for rating system details			Comments should concentrate on the adequacy, currency, and integration of the plan with other planning instruments
Management and Development Plan	D	1993 1993 -2001 2001 -2007		Need for review of the MDP
National parks and Wildlife Policy	L	2000		Need for review of the NPW Policy
National Parks and Wildlife ACT	L	1992 - 2004		
National Parks and Wildlife Strategic plan	L	2007 - 2011		

--	--	--	--	--

L = plan has force of law (i.e has been approved by parliament or is a legal instrument)	A = plan has been approved at Head of Agency level
G = plan has been approved by government but is not a legal instrument	D = plan is a draft and has not been formally approved
SA = plan has been approved at a senior level within the Agency	

<b>Analysis and conclusions</b>	There is need to urgently review, align and approve the current management plan in line with World Heritage Framework.
<b>Comparison with last assessment</b>	Not done
<b>Gaps and challenges</b>	The management plans take time to be approved  A number of mgnt plans implemented in draft formats.
<b>Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions</b>	Operation documents are available

## Worksheet 5b: Adequacy of Primary Planning Document

Name of document assessed MP, Wildlife Policy, \_\_\_\_\_

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comment/Explanation	Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions
Issue being assessed	Choose one of the four responses, ranked from very good to poor. The questions and responses can be refined to suit individual site needs	Tick box	Add any comments or explanations as to why the assessment was made	Discuss any recommendations or next steps in terms of actions which need to be taken following this assessment
<b>Decision making framework</b>				
1. Does the plan establish a clear understanding of the desired outcomes of management in clear terms rather than just specifying actions to be taken	Very Good - Desired outcomes are explicitly articulated		Preparing EoH document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved WP and Act</li> <li>• Need for review</li> </ul>
	Good - Desired outcomes are reasonably articulated	good		
	Fair - Desired outcomes are not clearly articulated but are implied or can be inferred from plan objectives			
	Poor - Plan focuses more on actions and doesn't indicate the desired outcomes for the site			

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comment/Explanation	Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions
2. Does the plan express the desired future for the site in a way that can assist management of new issues and opportunities that arise during the life of the plan?	Very Good - Desired future is expressed in a way that provides clear guidance for addressing new issues and opportunities		Preparing EoH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved WP and Act</li> <li>• Need for review</li> </ul>
	Good - Desired future is expressed in a way that gives some guidance for addressing new issues and opportunities	Good		
	Fair - Desired future is not clearly articulated and provides only limited guidance for addressing new threats and opportunities			
	Poor - The plan focuses more on present issues and doesn't provide guidance for addressing new threats and opportunities			
3. Does the plan provide for a process of monitoring, review and	Very Good - Plan provides a clear, explicit and appropriate process for monitoring, review and adjustment	Very good	It has assisted in the preparation of the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management Plan Drafted</li> <li>• Need for review and</li> </ul>

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comment/Explanation	Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions
adjustment during the life of the plan?	Good - Provisions for monitoring, review and adjustment of the plan are present but are incomplete, unclear or inappropriate in some minor respects		EoH	approval
	Fair - Need for monitoring, review and adjustment is recognised but is not dealt with in sufficient detail			
	Poor - Plan does not address the need for monitoring, review and adjustment			
<b>Planning context</b>				
4. Does the plan provide an adequate and appropriate policy environment for management of the World Heritage site?	Very Good - Policy requirements for the site are identified and adequate and appropriate policies are established with clear linkages to the desired future for the site	Very good	It has assisted in the preparation of the EoH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management Plan Drafted</li> <li>• Need for review and approval</li> </ul>
	Good - Policy requirements for the site are identified and policies are largely adequate and appropriate although there are gaps			

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comment/Explanation	Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions
	Fair - Policies in the plan are inadequate or incomplete in many respects			
	Poor - Plan either doesn't establish policies for the area or the policies are inadequate or inappropriate in major respects			
5. Is the plan integrated/linked to other significant national/regional/sectoral plans that influence management of the World Heritage site?	Very Good - Relevant national, regional and sectoral plans that affect the site are identified and specific mechanisms are included to provide for integration or linkage now and in the future	Very good	It has assisted in the preparation of the EoH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mgt Plan Drafted</li> <li>• Need for review and approval</li> </ul>
Good - Relevant national, regional and sectoral plans that affect the site are identified, their influence on the site is taken into account but there is little attempt at integration				
Fair - Some relevant national, regional and sectoral plans are identified but there is no attempt at integration				

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comment/Explanation	Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions
	Poor - No account is taken of other plans affecting the site			
<b>Plan Content</b>				
6. Is the plan based on an adequate and relevant information base?	Very Good - The information base for the plan is up to date and adequate in scope and depth and is matched to the major decisions, policies and issues addressed in the plan		It has assisted in the preparation of the EoH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management Plan Drafted</li> <li>• Need for review and approval</li> </ul>
	Good - The information base is adequate in scope and depth but maybe a little out dated and/or contains irrelevant information (i.e. a broad compilation of data rather than matching information to the decisions, policies and issues addressed in the plan)	good		
	Fair - The information base is out of date and/or has inadequacies in scope or depth so that some issues, decisions or policies cannot be placed into context			

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comment/Explanation	Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions
	Poor - Very little information relevant to plan decisions exists			
7. Have the values for the site been identified in the plan and linked to the management objectives and desired outcomes for the site?	Very Good - The site values have been clearly identified and linked to well defined management objectives and desired outcomes for the site		The site values have not been obviously identified or connected to management objectives and expected outcomes for the site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for world Heritage Management plan for the site(LMNP)</li> </ul>
Good - The site values have been reasonably identified and linked to management objectives and desired outcomes for the site				
Fair - The site values have not been clearly identified or linked to management objectives and desired outcomes for the site	Fair			
Poor - The site values have not been identified				
8. Does the plan address the primary issues facing management of the World Heritage Area within the	Very Good - Plan identifies primary issues for the site and deals with them within the context of the desired future for the site (i.e. plan is outcome rather than issues driven)		Issues are not specifically covered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for review of the management plan</li> </ul>



Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comment/Explanation	Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions
context of the desired future of the site?	Good - Plan identifies primary issues for the site but tends to deal with them in isolation or out of context of the desired future for the site	good		
	Fair - Some significant issues for the site are not addressed in the plan or the issues are not adequately addressed			
	Poor - Many significant issues are not addressed or are inadequately dealt with in the plan			
9. Are the objectives and actions specified in the plan represented as adequate and appropriate response to the issues?	Very Good - Objectives and actions are adequate and appropriate for all issues		Some values e.g. Educational, Resource use and Cultural Values not captured as part of the objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management Plan Drafted</li> <li>• Need for review and approval</li> </ul>
	Good - Objectives and actions are adequate and appropriate for most issues			
	Fair - Objectives and actions are frequently inadequate or inappropriate	Fair		

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comment/Explanation	Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions
	Poor - Objectives and actions in the plan do not represent an adequate or appropriate response to the primary issues			
10. Were local and indigenous communities living in or around the World Heritage site involved in developing the management plan and setting direction for the management of the World Heritage site?	Very Good - Local and indigenous communities living in or around the World Heritage site were meaningfully and fully involved in developing the management plan and setting direction for the World Heritage site		Local and indigenous communities living in or around the World Heritage site were partly involved in establishing the park and consulted when developing the draft management plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The review of Mgt Plan for further consultation</li> <li>• Development of Mgt Plan</li> </ul>
	Good - Local and indigenous communities living in or around the World Heritage site were partly involved in developing the management plan and setting direction for the World Heritage site	Good		
	Fair - Local and indigenous communities living in or around the World Heritage site were only minimally involved in developing the management plan and setting direction for the World Heritage site			

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comment/Explanation	Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions
	Poor - Local and indigenous communities living in or around the World Heritage site were not involved in developing the management plan and setting direction for the World Heritage site			
11. Does the plan take account of the needs and interests of local and indigenous communities living in or around the World Heritage site?	Very Good - Plan identifies the needs and interests of local and indigenous communities and has taken these into account in decision making	Very good	There is an opportunity for communities to use some of the resources in the Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidelines for resource utilisation are well documented</li> </ul>
	Good - Plan identifies the needs and interests of local and indigenous communities but it is not apparent that these have been taken into account in decision making			
	Fair - There is limited attention given to the needs and interests of local and indigenous communities and little account taken of these in decision making			
	Poor - No apparent attention has been given to the needs and interests of local and indigenous communities			

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comment/Explanation	Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions
12. Does the plan take account of the needs and interests of other stakeholders involved in the World Heritage site?	Very Good - Plan identifies the needs and interests of other stakeholders and has taken these into account in decision making	Very good		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is economic opportunity for stakeholders</li> </ul>
	Good - Plan identifies the needs and interests of other stakeholders but it is not apparent that these have been into account in decision making			
	Fair - There is limited attention given to the needs and interests of other stakeholders and little account taken of these in decision making			
	Poor - No apparent attention has been given to the needs and interests of other stakeholders			
13. Does the plan provide adequate direction on management actions that should be undertaken in	Very Good - Management actions specified in the plan can be clearly understood and provide a useful basis for developing operational plans such as work programmes and budgets			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is need for specific interventions to be outlined in the management plan</li> </ul>

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comment/Explanation	Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions
the World Heritage site?	Good - Management actions specified in the plan can generally be clearly understood and provide an adequate basis for developing operational plans such as work programmes and budgets	Good		
	Fair - Management actions are sometimes unclear or lacking in specificity making it difficult to use the plan as a basis for developing operational plans such as work programmes and budgets			
	Poor - Management actions are unclear or lacking in specificity making it very difficult to use the plan as a basis for developing operational plans such as work programmes and budgets			
14. Does the plan identify the priorities amongst strategies and actions in a	Very Good - Clear priorities are indicated within the plan in a way that supports work programming and allocation of resources			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Act and Policy Approved</li> <li>• Need for review of</li> </ul>

Question	Possible responses	Rating	Comment/Explanation	Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions
way that facilitates work programming and allocation of resources?	Good - Priorities are generally indicated making their use for work programming and resource allocation adequate most of the time	Good		the MP
	Fair - Priorities are not clearly indicated but may be inferred for work programming and resource allocation			
	Poor - There is no indication of priorities in the plan so that the plan cannot be used for work programming and resource allocation			

<b>Analysis and conclusions</b>	<p>The management plan is not addressing specifically the WHS values</p> <p>Operational funds for the Heritage site have to be clearly indicated in the management plan</p>
<b>Comparison with last assessment</b>	
<b>Gaps and challenges</b>	<p>Despite involving them stakeholders are not aware of the details of the draft management plan but the general rules and regulations</p> <p>Inadequate Resources for the management of world heritage site</p>
<b>Overall opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions</b>	<p>The management document is not approved; and therefore there is room for reviewing and approving it in line with what is obtaining on the ground and WHC expectations</p>

## Worksheet 6: Design Assessment

### 1. Ecological integrity

This relates to the major biodiversity and other natural values (refer to Tool 1a for a list of these major values):

Design aspect	Brief Explanation	Strengths of World Heritage site design in relation to this aspect	Weaknesses of World Heritage site design in relation to this aspect	Comments and explanations
<b>Key habitats</b>	Does site contain the key areas needed to conserve species and other natural values?	The lake, islands and the woodland	Fragmentation of the site (13 Islands, three mainland segments and 100m surrounding waters)	Management of the site becomes a challenge due fragmentation
<b>Size</b>	Is site large enough to conserve species and other natural values?	yes	Porosity of the site	Intensify law enforcement mechanism
<b>External interactions</b>	Do external interactions (e.g. adjacent land use) impact on site values?	yes	Encroachment	Intensify law enforcement mechanism
<b>Connectivity</b>	Can species move easily between the site and other	Yes	Encourages poaching	There is need for intensive monitoring



Design aspect	Brief Explanation	Strengths of World Heritage site design in relation to this aspect	Weaknesses of World Heritage site design in relation to this aspect	Comments and explanations
	suitable habitat?			

Sources of information	PMP, Field reports
Analysis and conclusions	The site is so fragmented and porosity that encourages poaching
Comparison with last assessment	None
Gaps and challenges	Inadequate funds to conduct monitoring and other management activities.
Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions	Room for scientific research

## 2. Community well-being

This relates to major cultural, economic, educational and other social values and other community/site issues important to the wellbeing of the community (refer to Tool 1a for a list of these values):

Design aspect	Brief Explanation	Strengths of World Heritage site design in relation to this aspect	Weaknesses of World Heritage site design in relation to this aspect	Comments and management action required
<b>Key areas</b>	Do local communities have access to key areas of cultural, religious or economic importance?	yes	Poracity and fragmentation with distances	Effective zonation
<b>Size</b>	Is the site large enough to deliver ecological services or support sustainable harvesting (if permitted)?	No	No clear guidelines for RUP	Need to produce RUP guidelines for the site
<b>External interactions</b>	Does the management of the site impact on local community functioning?	Yes	Low level of enforcement of RUP Inadequate meetings with the community	Enforce RUP Conduct regular meetings
<b>Legal status and tenure</b>	Are legal status and rights clear? Do conflicts impact on the community?	Yes	Inadequate Sensitisation of legal documents	Conduct regular sensitisation

<b>Sources of information</b>	Literature review and reports
<b>Analysis and conclusions</b>	The site provides access to the communities on resources but with no clear guidelines
<b>Comparison with last assessment</b>	None
<b>Gaps and challenges</b>	Inadequate sensitisation
<b>Opportunities, recommendations and follow-up actions</b>	Room for proper monitoring RUp

### 3. Management factors

This relates to the practicalities of management of the site (e.g. legal status, access for patrols and boundary issues with neighbours):

Design aspect	Brief Explanation	Strengths of World Heritage site design in relation to this aspect	Weaknesses of World Heritage site design in relation to this aspect	Comments and management action required
<b>Legal status and tenure</b>	Do problems or uncertainties over legal status or tenure affect capacity to manage?	yes	Strong sense of ownership by enclave villages	Need for sensitisation
<b>Access points</b>	Does lack of control over access to the site impact on management effectiveness?	yes	Inadequate funding	Lobby for more funds

