

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Waterton Glacier International Peace Park

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Canada
- United States of America

Type of Property

natural

Identification Number

354rev


Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1995

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Waterton Glacier International Peace Park	48.996 / -113.904	457614	0	457614	1995
Total (ha)		457614	0	457614	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Waterton Glacier International Peace Park - Map of the inscribed property	29/09/1993	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Jonathan Putnam
US National Park Service Office of International Affairs
World Heritage Program Officer
- Rebecca Kennedy
International Programs, Parks Canada
Program Specialist

Comment

Please replace Canadian contact information 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

- Doreen McGillis
Waterton Lakes Field Unit, Parks Canada Agency
External Relations Manager

Comment

Replace Canadian contact information with: Field Unit Superintendent P.O. Box 200 Waterton, Alberta T0K 2M0 Country: Canada (not Cambodia) Add (for Glacier National Park): Glacier National Park, National Park Service Jeff Mow Superintendent P.O. Box 128 West Glacier, MT 59936 United States Telephone: +011 (1) 406 888 7901 Fax: +011 (1) 406 888 7904 Email: kym_hall@nps.gov

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
2. [Glacier National Park \(U.S. National Park Service\)](#)
3. [World Heritage in Canada \(Parks Canada\)](#)
4. [Waterton - Glacier \(Parks Canada\)](#)
5. [Report on the State of Conservation \(Parks Canada\)](#)
6. [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](#)
7. [World Heritage in the United States](#)

Comment

Please remove: #1. Our Place photos #5. Report on State of Conservation for Canada For #4, please note the correct name for "Waterton Lakes National Park, Parks Canada"

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

Comment

Both parks designated first International Peace Park in 1932. Biosphere Reserve designation for Glacier in 1976 and Waterton in 1979.

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Significance

Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park has a distinctive climate, physiographic setting, mountain-prairie interface, and tri-ocean hydrographical divide. It is an area of significant scenic values with abundant and diverse flora and fauna.

Criteria

- (vii) Both national parks were originally designated by their respective nations because of their superlative mountain scenery, their high topographic relief, glacial landforms, and abundant diversity of wildlife and wildflowers.
- (ix) The property occupies a pivotal position in the Western Cordillera of North America resulting in the evolution of plant communities and ecological complexes that occur nowhere else in the world. Maritime weather systems unimpeded by mountain ranges to the north and south allow plants and animals characteristic of the Pacific Northwest to extend to and across the continental divide in the park. To the east, prairie communities nestle against the mountains with no intervening foothills, producing an interface of prairie, montane and alpine communities. The international peace park includes the headwaters of three major watersheds draining through significantly different biomes to different oceans. The biogeographical significance of this tri-ocean divide is increased by the many vegetated connections between the headwaters. The net effect is to create a unique assemblage and high diversity of flora and fauna concentrated in a small area.

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

(vii)(ix)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

- (vii) Superlative mountain scenery, their high topographic relief, glacial landforms, and abundant diversity of wildlife and wildflowers
- (ix) Plant communities, ecological processes,

critical habitat for species of concern, and diversity of wildlife and wildflowers

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

See 2.5 below

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

Canada and the United States are currently finalizing Statements of Outstanding Universal Value for some of their respective World Heritage sites. Pending Committee approval, these will be used for the next Periodic Reporting cycle.

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								
3.1.1	Housing								
3.1.2	Commercial development								
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure								
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities								
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure								
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure								
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure								
3.3	Services Infrastructures								
3.3.1	Water infrastructure								
3.3.4	Localised utilities								
3.3.5	Major linear utilities								
3.4	Pollution								
3.4.2	Ground water pollution								
3.4.4	Air pollution								
3.4.6	Input of excess energy								
3.5	Biological resource use/modification								
3.5.3	Land conversion								
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals								
3.5.6	Commercial wild plant collection								
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production								
3.6	Physical resource extraction								
3.6.1	Mining								
3.6.3	Oil and gas								
3.6.4	Water (extraction)								
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage								
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community								
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation								
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events								
3.10.2	Flooding								
3.10.3	Drought								
3.10.6	Temperature change								
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events								
3.11.4	Avalanche/ landslide								
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)								
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species								
3.12.1	Translocated species								
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species								
3.12.3	Invasive / alien freshwater species								
3.12.5	Hyper-abundant species								
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	
3.1 Buildings and Development						
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities	restricted	one off or rare	minor	high capacity	static
3.2 Transportation Infrastructure						
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	restricted	frequent	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.3 Services Infrastructures						
3.3.4	Localised utilities	restricted	on-going	minor	high capacity	increasing
3.4 Pollution						
3.4.4	Air pollution	widespread	on-going	minor	low capacity	static
3.4.6	Input of excess energy	restricted	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	decreasing
3.5 Biological resource use/modification						
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals	restricted	frequent	minor	low capacity	static
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production	restricted	on-going	insignificant	low capacity	increasing
3.6 Physical resource extraction						
3.6.3	Oil and gas	restricted	on-going	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.10 Climate change and severe weather events						
3.10.2	Flooding	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.10.3	Drought	widespread	frequent	minor	no capacity and / or resources	increasing
3.10.6	Temperature change	widespread	on-going	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.11 Sudden ecological or geological events						
3.11.4	Avalanche/ landslide	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)	extensive	on-going	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.12 Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species						
3.12.1	Translocated species	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	decreasing
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	static
3.12.5	Hyper-abundant species	restricted	on-going	minor	low capacity	increasing

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

3.17.1 - Comments

These negative factors primarily reflect: - 5.1.5: new paved trail (8 km. Kootenai Brown Trail) - 3.5.8: Bounty hunt for wolves in MD Cardston - 3.11.6: altered fire regime in aspen parkland ecosystem - 3.12.1: Stocking of non-native species, minor inappropriate plantings - 3.12.2: Knapweed and other non-native terrestrial species

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

The Waterton Biosphere Reserve is not defined as a buffer zone, but as a "zone of cooperation". Although it is not a politically recognized buffer zone, one is not needed, as existing land use agreements meet management needs.

4.2. Protective Measures

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

The Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park comprises Waterton Lakes National Park, Alberta, Canada and Glacier National Park, Montana, USA, both of which are ranked as IUCN Category II Protected Areas. Waterton Lakes National Park was set aside as a Forest Reserve in 1895 and reclassified as a Dominion Park in 1911 and a National Park

under the National Parks Act in 1930. It is Crown Land administered by Parks Canada, Gatineau, Quebec and managed from a parks headquarters in Waterton, Alberta. Glacier National Park was originally established as a National Park under its own legislation in 1911. It is Federal Land administered by the US Department of the Interior National Park Service, Washington, D.C., and managed from a parks headquarters in West Glacier, Montana. Parts of both parks have additional protection status under national legislation, a matter discussed in more detail in the body of the report. On 30 June 1932 the citizens and governing bodies of Canada and USA, by act of Royal Assent and Presidential Proclamation, respectively, commemorated the friendship and goodwill of Canada and the USA through the joint establishment of the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park – the first such park in the world. At the time it was recorded that the mutual co-ordination and consultation between the two national parks was essential for continued protection of the rich diversity of their natural and cultural resources. Further it was noted that the unique balance of natural resources constitutes an international ecological unit which is vital to the integrity of the two parks as a whole. In the 1970s Waterton and Glacier National Parks were designated as Biosphere Reserves under the UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Program. The Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1995.

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?

An **adequate** legal framework exists for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone, but **there are some deficiencies in its implementation** which undermine the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the property

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

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

4.2.4: insufficient staff levels to monitor livestock trespass, poaching, checkstations for aquatic invasive spp. Because of differences in laws in Canada and US, there are differences in the responses with respect to the following questions: - 4.2.4: .4 in US, .3 in Canada

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

Collaborative management occurs between Waterton Lakes and Glacier National Parks (NPs), and also between the parks and surrounding lands in the Crown of the Continent ecosystem through an array of partnerships with stakeholders, many of which are transboundary. These arrangements are designed to reach across traditional jurisdictional boundaries in the interest of rational approaches to management. Notable among these partnerships is the Crown Managers' Partnership linking some 20 government protection and resource management agencies in Canada and the US. Other important partnerships are: the Flathead Basin Commission with stewardship over water and resources in the Flathead watershed; the Waterton Biosphere Reserve focused on rangelands east of Waterton Lakes NP; the Flathead National Forest west of the property, part of which is in the Flathead basin; the Flathead Reservation of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, west of Glacier NP; and Akamina/Kishinena Provincial Park covering 10,000 ha west of Waterton Lakes NP, which is the traditional home of the native Ktunaxa- Kinbasket people. The International Joint Commission under the Boundary Waters Treaty (1909) is an important instrument for transboundary protection.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

Management Plans: Glacier National Park adopted a General Management Plan in 1999 that guides park management for 20 years. The 2010 Park Management Plan for Waterton Lakes National Park guides its park management for 10 years.

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 **excellent coordination** between all bodies / levels involved in the management of the property

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

Industry	Good
----------	------

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?

Indigenous peoples have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role

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

Because of differences in laws in Canada and US, there are differences in the responses with respect to the following questions: - 4.3.3: .2 in Canada, .3 in US - 4.3.7.2: 4 in US, 3 in Canada - 4.3.7.4: 4 in US, 3 in Canada - 4.3.8.4: 3 in Canada, 4 in US - 4.3.9.4: 3 in Canada, 4 in US - 4.3.10: 3 in Canada, 4 in US

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

none

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)	
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	
Governmental (National / Federal)	88%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	4%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	8%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	
Other grants	

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 **some flow** of economic benefits to local communities

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?

There is **basic** maintenance of equipment and facilities

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

Question 4.4.7: 3 in US, 4 in Canada

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

Full-time	97%
Part-time	3%

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

Permanent	25%
Seasonal	75%

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

Paid	92%
Volunteer	8%

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	Fair
Promotion	Good
Community outreach	Fair
Interpretation	Fair
Education	Good
Visitor management	Good
Conservation	Fair
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Fair

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	High
Tourism	Medium
Enforcement (custodians, police)	High

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

4.4.11 was answered using amount of time (calculated in hours) of paid staff vs volunteer to arrive at % reported. If we calculated using only numbers of each (vs time in hours), the percentage would be very different - 40% paid, 60% volunteer. The number of hours was converted to PY to get this answer.

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 with local participants and some national agencies**

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.PARKS, PEACE, AND PARTNERSHIP: GLOBAL INITIATIVES IN TRANSBOUNDARY CONSERVATION

Edited by Michael S. Quinn, Len Broberg, and Wayne Freimund ISBN 978-1-55238-643-9 2. Wolf, elk, and aspen food web relationships: Context and complexity Cristina Eisenberg, S. Trent Seager, David E. Hibbs. Dept. Forest Ecosystems and Society, College of Forestry, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR,

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

For Question 4.5.2, Parks Canada would say that there is CONSIDERABLE research and it IS directed towards management needs (which is not one of the available options). US response: 4.5.2.4 in US

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 and 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	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Poor
Local landowners	Poor
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Average
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

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 been an **important influence** on education, information and awareness building activities

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	Adequate
Site museum	Poor
Information booths	Excellent
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Excellent
Information materials	Excellent
Transportation facilities	Adequate

Other	Not needed
-------	------------

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

4.6.6.2 Site museum - there isn't one. Materials that would be included are in storage.

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
Visitor surveys
Other

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

The tourism/visitor management plan for the site is part of the management plans for the two national parks. In Glacier National Park, additional direction is found in the Commercial Services Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. In Waterton Lakes National Park, direction is found in the 2000 Community Plan and the commercial limits established in the Canada National Parks Act.

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 managed but **improvements could be made**

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 **some 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

For question 4.7, we used the following definitions for the visitation rating scale: 1. Decreasing: drop of 25% or more. 2. Static: within 25%, + or - 3. Minor increase: between 26 and 100% higher

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

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

Implementation is **underway**

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

For information from Report of the Reactive Monitoring Mission 2009, please see <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/354/documents>

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

A comprehensive monitoring program has been developed and implementation has begun within existing capacity.

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	
3.4	Pollution						
3.4.4	Air pollution	Visibility of superlative mountain scenery. Aquatic resources impacted by mercury and pesticides.	Worked with local plant to reduce emissions until it closed. Cooperate with Flathead Basin Commission and state agencies and participate in region wide studies. Seeking funding opportunities for additional monitoring for impacts related to energy development	Air quality monitoring station assesses several factors. Also testing mercury levels of fish in selected lakes. Water quality monitoring includes chemistry and bio-assessments.	ongoing	National Park Service, Environmental Protection Agency	This item relates to oil and gas exploration (including "fracking") on the east side of Glacier NP, hence no Canadian agencies involved.
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events						
3.10.3	Drought	Plant communities, ecological processes, critical habitat for species of concern, and diversity of wildlife and wildflowers.	Climate Change Response Strategy includes methods to reduce our carbon footprint, alter management techniques, provide education outreach, and conduct scientific research. Joint monitoring and planning in upcoming Climate Change workshop.	Weather stations located in several locations.	ongoing	Parks Canada Agency, National Park Service, US Geological Survey, US Fish & Wildlife Service, US Forest Service	Both agencies have participated in ongoing Climate Change planning initiatives. Workshop for using protected areas as climate change adaptation project is being planned for Spring 2014.
3.10.6	Temperature change	Plant communities, ecological processes, critical habitat for species of concern, and diversity of wildlife and wildflowers.	Climate Change Response Strategy includes methods to reduce our carbon footprint, alter management techniques, provide education outreach, and conduct scientific research.	Weather stations located in several locations as well as glacier and stream monitoring.	Ongoing	National Park Service, US Geological Survey, US Fish & Wildlife Service, Parks Canada	part of much larger, international efforts
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events						
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)	Plant communities, ecological processes, critical habitat for species of concern, and diversity of wildlife and wildflowers.	History of fire suppression has changed the fire regime and decreased the amount of native fescue prairie.	Monitoring is ongoing, and a prescribed fire program to re-establish the historic fire regime is planned.	Spring 2013 and ongoing, depending on weather and fuel conditions, as well as available resources.	Parks Canada, US Parks Service	There is a agreement to assist with wildfire control on both sides of the international boundary.
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species						
3.12.1	Translocated species	Plant communities, ecological processes, critical habitat for species of concern, and diversity of wildlife and wildflowers.	Management actions include hand-pulling, spraying, significant education efforts	monitoring of existing and new infestations	ongoing	Parks Canada, National Park Service, partners	part of larger, multi-jurisdictional efforts on both sides of border
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	Diversity of flora and fauna, with aggressive non-native plant species (such as knapweed) taking over native species and forage for native fauna, including a species at risk.	Removal program includes hand pulling and spot-spraying of herbicide, bio control using weevils.	Ongoing monitoring program	Ongoing	Parks Canada, US Parks Service, Southern Alberta Cooperative Weed Management Agency,	This program also involves a large number of volunteers, as individuals and in non-profit and corporate groups.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

Answers provided have not outlined any serious management need.

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

n/a

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	Positive
Research and monitoring	No impact
Management effectiveness	No impact
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	No impact
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	No impact
International cooperation	Very positive
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	No impact
Institutional coordination	No impact
Security	Positive
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

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

Because the property is already protected by the highest level of both State Parties, World Heritage status does not significantly affect the factors above (e.g., monitoring, management effectiveness)

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

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

clarification of parameters for Question 4.7.1

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 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 Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Management effectiveness

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

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

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

Automatically generated in online version

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

There were problems with some summary tables that were rectified by UNESCO staff.