

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Shark Bay, Western Australia


1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

Australia/Asia and the Pacific/natural/Marine & coastal/578/1991

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Shark Bay, Western Australia	-25.486 / 113.436	2197300	0	2197300	1991
Total (ha)		2197300	0	2197300	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Boundary of WH Area	28/09/1990	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

Comment

Mr Peter Burnett First Assistant Secretary Heritage and Wildlife Division Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities GPO Box 787, Australian Capital Territory, Australia 2601 Ph +61 2 6274 1111 Fax +61 2 6274 2095 Email: Peter.Burnett@environment.gov.au

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Peter Sharp
"Parks and Visitor Services"

Department of Environment & Conservation

Comment

Update DEC contact details. Peter Sharp is the Director, Parks and Visitor Services. Update telephone contact to 9442 0304 and fax to 9386 1286. Additional contact: Executive Officer (Cheryl Cowell) Department of Environment and Conservation Knight Terrace, DENHAM. Western Australia 6537 Ph (08) 9948 1208 Fax (08) 9948 1024 Email: cheryl.cowell@dec.wa.gov.au

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [The Official Site for Australian Travel and Tourism Australia](#)
2. [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](#)
3. [Shark Bay World Heritage Site \(Western Australia Department of Environment and Conservation\)](#)
4. [Shark Bay \(Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts\)](#)

Comment

1. Western Australia Department of Environment and Conservation Shark Bay World Heritage Property website: <http://www.sharkbay.org>
2. <http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/places/world/shark-bay/index.html>
3. <http://www.australia.com/>

Section II - Shark Bay, Western Australia (578)

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

A Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 1 February 2011, awaiting World Heritage Committee approval in June 2012.

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

(vii)(viii)(ix)(x)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Shark Bay World Heritage values please see <http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/places/world/shark-bay/values.html>

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






















































































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					
3.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities	  					
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.1 Pollution of marine waters	  					
3.5	Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.1 Fishing/collecting aquatic resources	  					
3.5.2 Aquaculture	  					
3.5.4 Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals	   					
3.6	Physical resource extraction					
3.6.1 Mining	   					
3.6.2 Quarrying	  					
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.1 Wind	  					
3.7.6 Water (rain/water table)	  					
3.7.7 Pests	   					
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.3 Indigenous hunting, gathering and collecting	  					
3.8.6 Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	  					
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.1 Storms	  					
3.10.3 Drought	  					
3.10.5 Changes to oceanic waters	  					
3.10.6 Temperature change	  					
3.10.7 Other climate change impacts	  					
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.3 Tsunami/tidal wave	   					
3.11.5 Erosion and siltation/ deposition	  					
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	   					
3.12.4 Invasive / alien marine species	   					
3.13	Management and institutional factors					
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

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.7	Pests	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	static
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	extensive	on-going	significant	medium capacity	static

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

3.17.1 - Comments

Invasive species - the major environmental pressure on Shark Bay's World Heritage values arises from the presence and potential introduction of foreign species, including feral animals, weeds and exotic marine organisms.

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 boundary is adequate to maintain listed WH values except for the east shore of Shark Bay Marine Park. Here, a stock-free management zone would address potential runoff from adjacent pastoral properties. Negotiations have commenced with one pastoral neighbour to establish fencing to create a stock-free zone adjacent to the property boundary. Other management solutions might also be explored

4.2. Protective Measures

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

Comment

All World Heritage properties in Australia are 'matters of national environmental significance' protected and managed

under national legislation, the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. By law, any action that has, will have, or is likely to have a significant impact on the World Heritage values of a World Heritage property must be referred to the responsible Minister for consideration. This includes impacts originating from outside the property boundary.

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

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

The Western Australian Conservation and Land Management Act 1984, which is the principal legislation for establishing and managing conservation reserves in WA, applies to those significant areas of the property which are currently, or proposed to be, under the jurisdiction of the Conservation Commission of Western Australia or Marine Parks and Reserves Authority.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

Shark Bay World Heritage Property Strategic Plan; Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserves Management Plan; Draft Shark Bay Terrestrial Reserves and Proposed Reserve Additions Mgt Plan; Communication and Interpretation Plan; Management

Paper for Fish Resources; SBWHP Landscape Study; Tamala-Carrarang Recreation and Tourism Plan; Gascoyne Regional Ecotourism Strategy; Basic Raw Materials for the Shark Bay World Heritage Property; Guidance, assessment of environmental factors, development proposals; et al

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	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Fair
Landowners	Fair
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 **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

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

The conservation estate has increased substantially since previous periodic reporting (2002) and includes; creation of Dirk Hartog Island National Park, Edel Land proposed national park (improvements include; track rehabilitation and composting toilets), and significant redevelopments at Bottle Bay and Eagle Bluff, Peron Homestead Heritage precinct, Little Lagoon and to roads.

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)	7%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	71%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	21%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	1%
Other grants	0%

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

Comment
Not applicable.

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

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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	75%
Part-time	25%

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

Permanent	85%
Seasonal	15%

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?

A range of human resources exist, but these are **below optimum** to manage the World Heritage Property.

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

Section II - Shark Bay, Western Australia (578)

Risk preparedness	Medium
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 **partially implemented**; some technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally **but most of the technical work is carried out by external staff**

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** for most key areas **but there are gaps**

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

There have been a significant amount of papers published since 2002, examples below. Access full list from Web link: <http://science.dec.wa.gov.au/conslib.php> and search, Shark Bay The Tidal regime of Shark Bay, Burling, M.C Microbial diversity of extant stromatolites in hypersaline marine environment of Shark Bay, Burns B.P

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

An overall agreed research plan for the property needs to be developed although it is noted that the Western Australian Department of Environment and Conservation coordinates a comprehensive research program across Western Australia including for biodiversity and social science.

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

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 education and awareness programme but it only **partly meets the needs** and could be improved

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

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

A project focusing on the Communication Strategy and Interpretation Action Plan for the property has recently been funded for three years. This will result in implementation of many of the key recommendations in the plan. The standard of interpretation is high, but because of the number of sites, projects are still to be implemented.

4.7. Visitor Management

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

Last year	Static
Two years ago	Static
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
Visitor surveys

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

Management plans for the marine and terrestrial conservation reserves and environments contain detailed strategies for the management and provision of recreational facilities and activities as well as for management and facilitation of nature-based tourism opportunities. A number of sites have individual recreation management plans, whilst others also have site development plans.

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 **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 **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

A project is underway to address the threat of unrestricted visitor use of some areas of the property. This project will focus on providing site definition, better vehicle and pedestrian access and a higher standard of facilities. During the next three years, significant steps will be made to formalise many of the previously ad-hoc visitor facilities, however, given the size of the property, this is a long-term proposition.

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	Average
Local / Municipal authorities	Non-existent
Local communities	Non-existent
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Non-existent
Industry	Non-existent
Local indigenous peoples	Poor

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

Monitoring is applied to management, however is limited in extent. Current examples include: loggerhead turtle surveys, dugong populations and conservation monitoring, Monkey Mia dolphin research and monitoring, various feral animal surveys and track counts, small vertebrate and Woma python monitoring, reintroduced fauna and sticknest rat monitoring, seagrass monitoring, and aerial surveys.

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	
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
3.7.7	Pests						
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events						
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/deposition	Natural criterion (i): Shark Bay contains, in one place, the most diverse and abundant examples of stromatolitic microbialites in the world. Erosion gullies on Hamelin Station and sediment deposition into Hamelin Pool will impact these structures.	A management plan to be formulated between DEC and Hamelin pastoral lessee re appropriate action to be taken to reduce any potential runoff into Hamelin Pool from the formation of erosion gullies on Hamelin Station.	Terrestrial and marine patrols are carried out by DEC officers to the Hamelin Station/Pool area on a regular basis and potential erosion/deposition occurrences reported and investigated.	On-going	Western Australian Department of Environment and Conservation - lead agency Pastoral lessee of Hamelin Station WA Marine Science Institute (WAMSI)	WAMSI currently conducting a project to address climate change threats and sea level rise in Property, including Hamelin Pool stromatolites. This will provide management tools to develop actions to mitigate threats to this WH value.
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species						
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	Natural criterion (iv): Shark Bay is a refuge for many species of plants and animals internationally recorded as rare, threatened or vulnerable. Significant environmental pressure to values from presence/potential introduction of foreign species.	Feral cat, fox and goat eradication programs in place. Weed infestations sprayed upon germination. Management procedures in place if introduced marine pests detected.	Regular comprehensive cat track counts, small vertebrate fauna & small and medium sized mammals and reptiles monitored twice annually. Sticknest rats monitored bi-annually. Monitoring for weed infestations after winter rains. Aerial goat surveys.	on-going	Department of Environment and Conservation (State government agency) Australian Quarantine Inspection Service (Australian government agency) - ballast water management and marine pest introductions.	None

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

The integrity of the Shark Bay World Heritage Property has been maintained since its inscription in 1991. Management arrangements have been, and continue to be, developed and implemented to ensure that actions to address potential threatening processes are undertaken in such a way as to minimise any impact on World Heritage values.

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

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

Does not contain enough capacity to describe beneficial management practices introduced and maintained to enhance the protection and conservation of the property. Answer choices too restrictive, should be expanded choices i.e numeric 1-7 or similar (greater graduation in scale). Too many multiple variables in the one question.

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

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Good
Advisory Body	Good

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

Most of the required information was accessible

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

The property's Outstanding Universal Value
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	None
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	None

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: A Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 1 February 2011, awaiting World Heritage Committee approval in June 2012.

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

The questionnaire does not contain enough capacity to describe the beneficial management practices introduced and maintained to enhance the protection and conservation of the property's World Heritage values in Shark Bay. Shark Bay's World Heritage advisory bodies did not contribute to the information provided in this questionnaire because the advisory bodies are in the process of being reorganised.