

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

• Canada

Type of Property

natural

Identification Number

304bis


Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1984, 1990

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks	51.425 / -116.48	2306884	0	2306884	1984
Total (ha)		2306884	0	2306884	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks - Map of the inscribed property	10/10/1990	

Comment

The current map is accurate however Canada intends to submit an improved version (i.e. better layout/sizing) as part of the upcoming Retrospective Inventory project.

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

• Rebecca Kennedy
International Programs, Parks Canada
Program Specialist

Comment

Please replace with: Vice President, Heritage Conservation and Commemoration Directorate Parks Canada Agency 25, rue Eddy, étage/floor 5 K1A 0M5 Gatineau Canada
Telephone: +1(819) 994-1808 Fax: +1 (819) 934-1115

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

• Susan Kennard
Banff Field Unit
Heritage Programs Manager

Comment

Susan Kennard, Heritage Programs Manager and World Heritage contact for Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks Banff Field Unit, Parks Canada P.O. Box 900 T1L 1K2 Banff Canada Telephone: +1 (0) 403 762 1461 Fax: +1 (0) 403 762 1584 Email: susan.kennard@pc.gc.ca *see attached document for Superintendent contacts for all 7 parks within the CRMP WHS designated area.

Section II-Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
2. [World Heritage in Canada \(Parks Canada\)](#)
3. [Jasper National Park \(Parks Canada\)](#)
4. [Kootenay National Park \(Parks Canada\)](#)
5. [Yoho National Park \(Parks Canada\)](#)
6. [Banff National Park \(Parks Canada\)](#)
7. [Report on the State of Conservation \(Parks Canada\)](#)
8. [The Burgess Shale](#)
9. [Natural site datasheet from WCMC, Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas](#)

Comment

CORRECT these National Park links: Jasper <http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/pn-np/ab/jasper/index.aspx> Kootenay <http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/pn-np/bc/kootenay/index.aspx> Yoho <http://www.pc.gc.ca/pn-np/bc/yoho/index.aspx> REMOVE: OUR PLACE Report on State of Conservation WCMC, Mana Pools National Park ADD provincial parks: <http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/explore/parkpgs/hamber/> http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/explore/parkpgs/mt_robson/ http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/explore/parkpgs/mt_assiniboin

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

Comment

n/a

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Significance

Renowned for their scenic splendor, the Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks are comprised of Banff, Jasper, Kootenay and Yoho national parks and Mount Robson, Mount Assiniboine and Hamber provincial parks. Together, they exemplify the outstanding physical features of the Rocky Mountain Biogeographical Province. Classic illustrations of glacial geological processes — including icefields, remnant valley glaciers, canyons and exceptional examples of erosion and deposition — are found throughout the area. The Burgess Shale Cambrian and nearby Precambrian sites contain important information about the earth's evolution.

Criteria

(vii) The seven parks of the Canadian Rockies form a striking mountain landscape. With rugged mountain peaks, icefields and glaciers, alpine meadows, lakes, waterfalls, extensive karst cave systems and deeply incised canyons, the Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks possess exceptional natural beauty, attracting millions of visitors annually.

(viii) The Burgess Shale is one of the most significant fossil areas in the world. Exquisitely preserved fossils record a diverse, abundant marine community dominated by soft-bodied organisms. Originating soon after the rapid unfolding of animal life about 540 million years ago, the Burgess Shale fossils provide key evidence of the history and early evolution of most animal groups known today, and yield a more complete view of life in the sea than any other site for that time period. The seven parks of the Canadian Rockies are a classic representation of significant and on-going glacial

processes along the continental divide on highly faulted, folded and uplifted sedimentary rocks.

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

(vii)(viii)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Oriented in a south-eastern to north-western direction along the Continental Divide. Active glaciers and ice fields still exist throughout the region. The Columbia ice fields of Jasper National Park are regarded as the hydrographic apex of North America and are the headwaters to three major river systems: the North Saskatchewan River, the Athabasca River and the Columbia River. The Rockies have been divided into three life zones or ecoregions: montane, subalpine and alpine. A total of 56 mammalian species have been recorded. Some 280 avifaunal species have been noted.

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

Canada is currently finalizing Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value for 13 of its World Heritage sites. Pending committee approval, these will be used for the next Periodic Reporting cycle.

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

no comments

3. Factors Affecting the Property






















3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

White pine blister rust, a non-native pathogen is threatening the persistence of whitebark pine. Historical stocking of non-native fish species is currently impacting most waters in BNP and affecting SARA listed species such as Westslope Cuthroat Trout. Intensive efforts are underway to control key non-native plant species and prevent spread to remote areas. Possibility of reintroducing Plains Bison into BNP. Will restore biodiversity but require fencing which may affect other species.

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact	Origin
3.1	Buildings and Development		
3.1.3	Industrial areas	  	
3.3	Services Infrastructures		
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities	   	
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events		
3.10.6	Temperature change	   	
3.13	Management and institutional factors		
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities	   	
Legend	 Current	 Potential	 Negative  Positive  Inside  Outside

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.6	Temperature change	localised	on-going	minor	no capacity and / or resources	increasing

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

3.17.1 - Comments

no 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

no comments

4.2. Protective Measures

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

The site consists of four national parks and three British Columbia provincial parks:

- Banff National Park
- Yoho National Park
- Kootenay National Park
- Jasper National Park
- Mt. Assiniboine Provincial Park
- Hamber Provincial Park
- Mt. Robson Provincial Park

The national parks are part of the national parks system of Canada. All land within the parks is owned and managed by the Canadian Government and is dedicated to the people of Canada for their benefit, education and enjoyment. The provincial parks are part of the provincial park system of the

Province of British Columbia. All land within the parks is owned by the Province of British Columbia and is managed for the preservation of the natural environment and the use and enjoyment of the public.

Canada National Parks Act (2000) and associated regulations Parks Canada Agency Act (1998)

Parks Canada's Guiding Principles and Operational Policies Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (2003)

Species at Risk Act (2002)

Fisheries Act (1985)

Protected Areas Act (BC 2000)

Park Act (BC 2000) and associated regulations

The Canada National Parks Act (2000) requires that "the maintenance or restoration of ecological integrity, through the protection of natural resources and natural processes, shall be the first priority of the Minister when considering all aspects of the management of parks." The Parks Canada Agency Act (1998) established an Agency "for the purpose of ensuring that Canada's national parks, national historic sites and related heritage areas are protected and represented for this and future generations and in order to further the achievement of the national interest as it is related to those parks, sites and heritage areas and related programs."

Comment

In addition to the above the following Management Plans are in place for the individual parks within the WHS designated area. Jasper National Park Management Plan 2010, Banff National Park Management Plan 2010, Kootenay National Park Management Plan 2010, Yoho National Park Management Plan 2010, Mount Robson Park Management Plan 2011, Hamber Provincial Park Master Plan 1986, Mount Assiniboine Provincial Park Management Plan 2012

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 **excellent** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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

no comment

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

The four national parks are managed under the authority of the Canada National Parks Act and the Parks Canada Agency Act, plus Parks Canada's Guiding Principles and Operational Policies. The three provincial parks are managed under the authority of the Park Act and the Protected Areas of British Columbia Act and associated regulations and policies.

There is no single management authority for the site. All parks within the Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks World Heritage Site are managed under national parks or British Columbia provincial parks regulations and authorities. A variety of arrangements are in place for coordination and collaboration on a variety of management and operational issues. The park managers of provincial and national parks work together and with managers of adjacent lands with respect to: human use management, human access, wildlife and vegetation management, and transportation planning. First Nations are consulted on broad management issues, however they are not directly involved in park management. There are also specific inter-agency committees to promote information exchange and collaborative review of land management and resource issues including the Central Rockies Ecosystem Interagency Liaison Group, the Bow Corridor Ecosystem Advisory Group, the Foothills Model Forest, and the government of British Columbia's Interagency Management Committee. There are four communities within the national parks – Banff, Lake Louise, Field and Jasper – for which a variety of management structures have been established. In general, these facilitate a financial structure so that municipal resources from leaseholders can be used to support community infrastructure. The Parks Canada Agency maintains control of planning approvals and land use in order to protect national park and World Heritage values.

Day-to-day management of the national parks is directed by the Field Unit Superintendents who report via the Executive Director of Mountain Parks and the Director General of Western and Northern Canada to the Chief Executive Officer of the Parks Canada Agency.

Day-to-day management of the British Columbia provincial parks is the responsibility of the regional managers who report to the Assistant Deputy Minister.

There is no single plan for the site but the management plans for the individual parks are co-ordinated. All Canadian national parks are required, in accordance with the Canada National Parks Act and the Parks Canada Agency Act, to have a current management plan which is reviewed at least every five years. The Banff National Park Management Plan was approved in 1997. The management plans for Yoho, Kootenay and Jasper National Parks were approved in 2000. All four parks are zoned into five management categories: Special Preservation, Wilderness, Natural Environment, Outdoor Recreation and Park Services. The Wilderness category comprises 95 per cent of the total land area. The management plans emphasize the retention of ecological integrity and, where appropriate, the restoration of areas that have been compromised by past human activities. The long history of human use and enjoyment of the parks is recognized and affirmed and limits are placed on visitor facilities and services in order to protect ecological integrity. Heritage tourism, which emphasizes appropriate activities, is a guiding principle. Regional integration of land use management with

Section II-Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks

surrounding neighbours is encouraged because of the extensive habitat requirements of some key wildlife species such as grizzly bears and wolves. The Banff National Park Management Plan was publicly reviewed in 2003.


Amendments were made in 2004 which provide an updated grizzly bear management framework and a human use management strategy geared to improving visitor opportunities and reducing ecological impacts. All management plans have been developed with extensive public involvement.

Mt. Assiniboine Provincial Park's Management Plan was approved in 1989; a review is scheduled for 2005/06. The management plan for Hamber was approved in 1987 and for Mt. Robson in 1992. Both Mt. Robson and Hamber have updated Purpose Statements.

Comment

Add Foothills Research Institute to inter-agency sentence. Remove last para "Mt Assin....Purpose Statements." replace with: The following documents are the management plans for the 7 parks. Jasper National Park Management Plan 2010, Banff National Park Management Plan 2010, Kootenay National Park Management Plan 2010, Yoho National Park Management Plan 2010, Mount Robson Park Management Plan 2011, Hamber Provincial Park Master Plan 1986, Mount Assiniboine Provincial Park Management Plan

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Mount Robson Provincial Park Ecosystem Management Plan	N/A	Available	01/01/2001	
Mount Robson Provincial Park Master Plan	N/A	Available	01/01/1992	
Jasper National Park of Canada Management Plan	N/A	Available	01/01/2000	
Kootenay National Park of Canada Management Plan	N/A	Available	01/01/2000	
Yoho National Park of Canada Management Plan	N/A	Available	01/01/2000	
Banff National Park of Canada. Management Plan. Amended May 2004	N/A	Available	01/01/2004	
Hamber Provincial Park. Master Plan	N/A	Available	01/01/1986	
Master Plan for Mount Assiniboine Provincial Park	N/A	Available	01/01/1989	

Comment

http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/explore/parkpgs/mt_robson/mt-robson-mp-march2011.pdf

http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/planning/mgmtplns/hamber/hamber_mp.pdf

http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/planning/mgmtplns/mt_assiniboine/mt_assiniboine_mp_final.pdf <http://www.pc.gc.ca/pn-np/ab/jasper/plan/plan9.aspx> <http://www.pc.gc.ca/pn-np/ab/banff/plan/gestion-management.aspx> <http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/docs/v-g/yoho/plan1/index.aspx> <http://www.pc.gc.ca/docs/v-g/kootenay/plan1/index.aspx>

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**

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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 **most or all activities** are being implemented and monitored

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	Fair
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Fair
Industry	Not applicable

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 **directly contribute** to some decisions relating to 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?

Indigenous peoples directly contribute to **some decisions** relating to management but their involvement could be improved

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 contact but only **some cooperation** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

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

In Mount Robson Park, the operator of the pipeline through the park has been involved in management along the transportation corridor and provided funding to support projects that improved ecological connectivity in Jasper and Mount Robson parks.

4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World

Section II-Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks

Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report

In Mount Robson Park, a 478 hectare area in the transportation corridor was converted to a Protected Area under the Environment and Land Use Act to allow the pipeline (previously permitted in 1950s) operator to expand its pipeline capacity. The project included areas where the pipeline was re-routed to reduce environmental impacts to the Fraser River.

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)	20%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	30%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	50%
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)

Comment

No assistance is received from the World Heritage Fund

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

The available budget is **sufficient** but further funding would enable more effective management to international best practice standard

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

no comment

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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

Full-time	25%
Part-time	75%

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

Permanent	30%
Seasonal	70%

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

Paid	95%
Volunteer	5%

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)	Fair

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

no comment

Section II-Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks

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

4.5.4 Mount Robson Park is a popular location for universities to conduct research.

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

See attached document for research bibliography

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	Excellent
Local landowners	Excellent
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Average

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

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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?

There is **excellent presentation and interpretation** of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property

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	Not needed
Information booths	Excellent
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Excellent
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Not needed

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

no comment

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	Static
Four years ago	Static
Five years ago	Static

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

Entry tickets and registries
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys
Other

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

Berg Lake Corridor Plan 2000

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

Section II-Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks

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

There is **limited 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

no comment

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** for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

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	Not applicable
Local communities	Average
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Average
Industry	Not applicable
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

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

Implementation is **complete**

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

n/a

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

no comment

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

	World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events						
3.10.6	Temperature change	(vii) icefields and glaciers	Public interpretation and signage. Provision of information to visitors about the impacts of climate change on glaciers.	Monitoring glacier mass-balance (snow accumulation and melt) on the Athabasca, Peyto, Saskatchewan and Yoho Glaciers. Facilitating external researchers study of the glaciers. Significant glacial research on the Columbia Icefields.	On-going	Parks Canada, Geological Survey of Canada, National Research Council of Canada, University of Alberta, University of Saskatchewan,	2 significant documents written on glacier/climate data. Sandford's "Cold Matters - The State and Fate of Canada's Fresh Water" and "Peyto Glacier - Once Century of Science". Glaciers uniquely accessible. Visitors noticing recession, less visible.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

Answers provided have not outlined any serious management need.

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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

no comment

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	Positive
Funding for the property	Very positive
International cooperation	Very positive
Political support for conservation	Very positive
Legal / Policy framework	Very positive
Lobbying	Not applicable
Institutional coordination	Very positive
Security	Very positive
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

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

no comment

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
Staff from other World Heritage properties

Section II-Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks

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

n/a

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

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

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 concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
Monitoring and reporting

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

• **Map(s)**

Reason for update: The current map is accurate however Canada intends to submit an improved version (i.e. better layout/sizing) as part of the upcoming Retrospective Inventory project.

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

no comment