

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Kinabalu Park

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Malaysia

Type of Property

natural

Identification Number

1012


Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2000

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Kinabalu Park	6.25 / 116.5	75370	0	75370	2000
Total (ha)		75370	0	75370	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Location Map-Kinabalu Park	13/07/1999	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

Comment

The Board of Trustees of the Sabah Parks, SABAH, MALAYSIA [Publicly known as Sabah Parks].

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- LUDIN APIN
Head of Park Operations (Parks Management and Enforcement)

Comment

Property Manager: Mr. Ludi Apin, Head of Parks Management and Operations Division Address: The Board of Trustees of the Sabah Parks, Lots 45 & 46, 1st-%th Floor, Block H, Signature Office, KK Time Square, P.O.Box 10626, 88806 KOTA KINABALU, SABAH, MALAYSIA Telephone: +(6088) 523500 Fax: +(088)-486434 E-mail: sabahparks@gmail.com, Ludi.Apin@sabah.gov.my

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. 1001wonders.org : visit this site in panophotographies - 360 x 180 degree images
2. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
3. [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](#)

Comment

Website: www.sabahparks.org.my

1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Comment

The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for this Property was submitted and approved at the 35th Session of the World Heritage Committee Meeting in Paris, June 2011.

2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed

(ix)(x)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Criterion (ix): Kinabalu Park has an exceptional array of naturally functioning ecosystems. Criterion (x): Kinabalu Park is species-rich in flora and is an important Centre of Plant Endemism in the world.

2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised

2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was approved by the World Heritage Centre in June 2011.

3. Factors Affecting the Property

3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

Name	Impact				Origin
3.1	Buildings and Development				
3.1.4 Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure					
3.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities					
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage				
3.8.1 Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses					
3.8.2 Society's valuing of heritage					
3.8.6 Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation					
3.13	Management and institutional factors				
3.13.1 Low impact research / monitoring activities					
3.13.3 Management activities					
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside Outside

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

No factor is both current and negative.

3.17. Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to factors affecting the property

3.17.1 - Comments

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is no buffer zone, and it is not needed

4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The property had no buffer zone at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The property had no buffer zone at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

Although the Property had no buffer zone at the time of inscription, it is surrounded by conservation zones protected under other laws that effectively act as a buffer zone to the Property. These conservation zones are Wildlife Corridor, Water Conservation Area and 50 metre corridor surrounding the rest of the Property. Thus, this Property enjoys the protection of a buffer zone.

4.2. Protective Measures

4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional)

In Sabah, national parks including Kinabalu are established and managed at the State level under the State of Sabah Parks Enactment of 1984 and Amendment of 1996. Malaysia's national park act does not apply to Sabah (or Sarawak) and it is thus the state level of government that will carry the prime responsibility for the implementing the Convention in Malaysia (as is the case in other federal systems).

Comment

In Sabah, state parks are established and managed under the Parks Enactment 1984. The Property is managed by Sabah Parks Board of Trustees under the state government while signatory to the Convention is the federal Government of Malaysia.

4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides an adequate or better basis for effective management and protection

4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The property had no buffer zone at the time of inscription on the World Heritage List

4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides an adequate or better basis for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?

There is acceptable capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies remain

4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures

In June 2011, the Board of Trustees of the Sabah Parks formed a legislative committee to strengthen the law (Parks Enactment) and Regulations were made in order to strengthen the protective measures of the Parks.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

The Board of Trustees of the Sabah Parks, established and constituted under section 24 of the Parks Enactment, 1984, is responsible for the management and control of the Parks. The Board comes under the jurisdiction of the State Ministry of Tourism Development, Environment, Science and Technology. Under section 45 (2) of the Parks Enactment, 1984, the Board shall have power among others: (a) to provide and maintain adequate and efficient services and facilities at all parks; (b) to promote the use, improvement and development of the parks; (c) to ensure the security and well being of the animal and vegetation in a park and the preservation of such park the natural features and the animal and vegetation in their natural state; and (d) to reserve or set side any

portions of a park as breeding places for animals and as nurseries for vegetation. A management plan was prepared in 1993.

Comment

The current Management Plan is in the process of being revised. Also, in June 2011, the Board of Trustees of the Sabah Parks formed a legislative committee to strengthen protection of the Property. Thus, the Property is consistently being monitored in order to strengthen its protective measures to ensure that its OUV is protected.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
The Kinabalu Park Development Masterplan Towards Sustained Development & A Development Plan for Kinabalu Park Nature and Golf Resort	N/A	Available	13/07/1999	

Comment

The revised Management Document will be ready by 2012.

4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?

There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies / levels involved in the management of the property **but it could be improved**

4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?

The management system / plan is **fully adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

The management system is being **fully** implemented and monitored

4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?

An annual work / action plan exists and **many activities** are being implemented

4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following

Local communities / residents	Good
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Good
Landowners	Good
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Fair
Industry	Fair

4.3.8 - If present, do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Local communities have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management

4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

No indigenous peoples are resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone

4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?

There is **regular contact** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone and **substantial co-operation** on management

4.3.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

Relevant stakeholders and local communities will be involved during the consultation period of planning process. This will ensure a holistic management approach. In the case of this Property, there are no indigenous groups present as a community made up of various ethnic groups of Sabah.

4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report

There are no significant changes.

4.4. Financial and Human Resources

4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	0%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	100%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	0%

4.4.2 - International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)

4.4.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

4.4.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?

The existing sources of funding **are secure** in the medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding in the long-term

4.4.5 - Does the World Heritage property provide economic benefits to local communities (e.g. income, employment)?

There is a **major flow** of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the World Heritage property

4.4.6 - Are available resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

4.4.7 - Are resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure adequately maintained?

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

4.4.8 - Comments, conclusion, and / or recommendations related to finance and infrastructure

4.4.9 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Full-time	100%
Part-time	0%

4.4.10 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	0%

4.4.11 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

4.4.12 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?

Human resources are **adequate** for management needs

4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Good
Promotion	Good
Community outreach	Good
Interpretation	Good
Education	Good
Visitor management	Good
Conservation	Good
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Good
Tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Medium
Promotion	Medium

Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	Medium
Education	Medium
Visitor management	Medium
Conservation	Medium
Administration	Medium
Risk preparedness	Medium
Tourism	Medium
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Medium

4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?

A capacity development plan or programme is **in place and fully implemented**; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, who are assuming leadership in management

4.4.16 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient**

4.5.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme of research**, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared widely** with the local, national and international audiences

4.5.4 - Please provide details (i.e. authors, title, and web link) of papers published about the World Heritage property since the last Periodic Report

1) Authors: Mohd Nadzri Ishak, Maryati Mohamed and Marcos Jopony Title: ichthyofauna Survey of Sayap, Kinabalu Park, Sabah, Malaysia in Sabah Parks Nature Journal Vol. 8 Date published: October 2007 2) Authors: J. Lindley McKay Title: An Observation of the Rare Agamid Lizard Calotes kinabaluensis de Grijs in Sabah Parks Nature Journal Vol. 8 Date Published: October 2007

4.5.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to scientific studies and research projects

The research conducted have provided management with scientific evidence that the OUV is intact.

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?

In many locations, but not easily visible to visitors

4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities / residents	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Excellent
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Excellent
Visitors	Excellent
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Excellent

4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?

There is a **planned and effective** education and awareness programme that contributes to the protection of the World Heritage property

4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?

World Heritage status has influenced education, information and awareness building activities, **but it could be improved**

4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is adequately presented and interpreted **but improvements could be made**

4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

Visitor centre	Excellent
Site museum	Adequate
Information booths	Adequate
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Excellent
Other	Not needed

4.6.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to education, information and awareness building

4.7. Visitor Management

4.7.1 - Please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years

Last year	Minor Increase
Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Minor Increase

4.7.2 - What information sources are used to collect trend data on visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries
Accommodation establishments

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

In the revised Management Plan to be completed in 2012, one section will be dedicated to Visitor Management and this will be deposited with WHC. .

4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is **effectively managed** and does not impact its Outstanding Universal Value

4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?

There is **excellent co-operation** between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation

4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

The fee is collected and makes a **substantial contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property

4.8. Monitoring

4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme** of monitoring, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient and key indicators have been defined but **monitoring the status of indicators could be improved**

4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Average
Local communities	Average
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Average
Industry	Average
Local indigenous peoples	Average

4.8.4 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?

No relevant Committee recommendations to implement

4.8.5 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee

4.8.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to monitoring

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

No factor is both current and negative.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

Please select your top management needs in question 4.9 before filling in the summary table.

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

Not applicable (for sites inscribed exclusively under criteria vii to x)

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property is **intact**

5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **maintained**.

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

Other important cultural and / or natural values and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

5.4. Additional comments on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.4.1 - Comments

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas

Conservation	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Very positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Very positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Very positive
Infrastructure development	Very positive
Funding for the property	Very positive
International cooperation	Very positive
Political support for conservation	Very positive
Legal / Policy framework	Very positive
Lobbying	Very positive
Institutional coordination	Very positive
Security	Very positive
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status

6.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of this Section of the Periodic Report

Governmental institution responsible for the property
Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
Local community

6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable?

yes

6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

This questionnaire can be improved to allow for more accurate response if the scale of rating is more gradual. For example, question 4.7.1 should allow a slot between minor and major (medium): so too question 4.8.3 should have a slot between average and excellent (good).

6.6 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire from the following entities

UNESCO	Very good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Very good

6.7 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?

All required information was accessible

6.8 - The Periodic Reporting process has improved the understanding of the following

The World Heritage Convention
The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

6.9 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities

UNESCO	Not Applicable
State Party	Not Applicable
Site Managers	Not Applicable
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

• Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Reason for update: The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for this Property was submitted and approved at the 35th Session of the World Heritage Committee Meeting in Paris, June 2011.

6.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise