

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Lorentz National Park

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Indonesia

Type of Property

natural

Identification Number

955

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1999


1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Lorentz National Park	-4.75 / 137.833	2505600	0	2505600	1999
Total (ha)		2505600	0	2505600	

Comment

The Committee noted that as per the request of 25 October 1999 from the Indonesian authorities, an adjustment of approximately 150,000 hectares were made to exclude oil exploration concessions in the south-east corner of the Park. The Committee accepted this reduction in the size of the property and agreed with the new boundaries. The modified size of the site is now about 2.35 million hectares.

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Lorentz National Park Nominated Site	16/09/1988	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

Comment

Lorentz National Park Directorate General of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation The Ministry of Forestry Republic of Indonesia

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Ir. Yunus Rumarar
Balai TN lorentz

Comment

Balai Taman Nasional Lorentz Ir. Yunus Rumarar Address : Jl. SD Percobaan - Potikelek, Kotak Pos 176, Wamena - 99511, Jayawijaya, Province of Papua, Indonesia Telephone : 62 96934098, 62 96933006, Faksimile 62 96934098 Email lorentz.btn@gmail.com

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](#)

Comment

not available

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

Comment

ASEAN Heritage Parks (2003)

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

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

(viii)(ix)(x)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

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)

Partnership Relevant : Positive, Current, Inside and Outside

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						
3.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities						
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.1 Ground transport infrastructure						
3.2.2 Air transport infrastructure						
3.2.4 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure						
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.3 Surface water pollution						
3.4.5 Solid waste						
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						
3.5.5 Crop production						
3.5.6 Commercial wild plant collection						
3.5.7 Subsistence wild plant collection						
3.5.8 Commercial hunting						
3.5.9 Subsistence hunting						
3.5.10 Forestry /wood production						
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.3 Temperature						
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.1 Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses						
3.8.2 Society's valuing of heritage						
3.8.3 Indigenous hunting, gathering and collecting						
3.8.4 Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system						
3.8.5 Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community						
3.9	Other human activities					
3.9.1 Illegal activities						
3.9.2 Deliberate destruction of heritage						
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						
3.11.5 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						
3.12.3 Invasive / alien freshwater species						

		Name	Impact	Origin	
3.13		Management and institutional factors			
3.13.1 Low impact research / monitoring activities					
3.13.3 Management activities					
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside
					Outside

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.1 Buildings and Development					
3.1.1 Housing	restricted	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.2 Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.1 Ground transport infrastructure	restricted	frequent	significant	high capacity	increasing
3.2.4 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	localised	frequent	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.5 Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.6 Commercial wild plant collection	restricted	frequent	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
3.5.8 Commercial hunting	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	static
3.5.10 Forestry /wood production	localised	frequent	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.3 Temperature	restricted	one off or rare	significant	low capacity	decreasing
3.9 Other human activities					
3.9.1 Illegal activities	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	static
3.9.2 Deliberate destruction of heritage	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.10 Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.2 Flooding	restricted	one off or rare	minor	low capacity	static
3.10.3 Drought	restricted	one off or rare	significant	low capacity	static
3.10.6 Temperature change	restricted	one off or rare	significant	medium capacity	static
3.11 Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.4 Avalanche/ landslide	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	static
3.11.5 Erosion and siltation/ deposition	restricted	frequent	minor	low capacity	static
3.11.6 Fire (wildfires)	restricted	one off or rare	minor	low capacity	static
3.12 Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.1 Translocated species	restricted	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	decreasing

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

3.17.1 - Comments

The management body for Lorentz National Park has been increasing their capacity to respond the negative factors which will probably create a more significant impact in the future

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, but there is a need for one

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 the management authority but **are not known by 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 boundaries of the World Heritage property have to be known by local residents/communities/landowners. The property need buffer zone to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

4.2. Protective Measures

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

The area was first given protected status by the Dutch Colonial Government in 1919, with the establishment of the Lorentz Nature Monument.

In 1978 it was established as a Strict Nature Reserve (Cagar Alam) by the Indonesian Government (44/Kpts/Um/1/1978), with an area of 2,150,000 hectares. In 1991 the area was listed as one of the sites with highest priority for conservation in Indonesia's National Biodiversity Action Plan. In 1996 WWF and the provincial department

of forestry (Kanwil Kehutanan) proposed a revision of the reserve boundaries and change the status to become a National Park. The Director General for Nature Conservation and Forest Protection excepted this revision in July 1996. In March 1997 the Minister of Forestry declared the Lorentz area a National Park, that includes a western extension (Mt.Trikora, Mt.Rumphius, Lake Habbema area) and coastal waters.

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?

An adequate legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are **some deficiencies in implementation**

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 are **major deficiencies** in 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 management body for Lorentz National Park needs regulation that can provide a solution regarding the rights and obligations of indigenous peoples who living in or near the area


4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

Comment

The management body for Lorentz national park has been established in 2007 under Ministry of Forestry Decree No.P03/Menhut-II/2007, led by the national park manager. Lorentz National Park comprises three regional offices, namely : 1. Timika covers Mimika, Asmat, Paniai and Intan jaya district 2. Dekai covers Yahukimo, Asmat, Nduga, Jayawajiya and Lanni Jaya district 3. Ilaga covers Puncak, Puncak Jaya, Intan Jaya and Lan Jaya

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Lorentz National Park World Heritage Area	N/A	Available	01/01/2005	

Comment

Lorentz National Park management documents consist of : - Lorentz National Park Management Plan 2010 - 2029 - Lorentz National Park Strategic Plan 2010 - 2014 - A New Zonation Plan Development has been initiated in 2010

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 only partially 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	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Good
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Poor
Industry	Fair

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

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

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

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

Lorentz management system is inadequate to cover the 2.35 million hectares. Lack of resources in term of numbers and capacity is the major challenges to maintain huge area of the property.

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



there is no significant changes in the legal status of the property.

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)	90%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	10%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0%
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)

Title	Year	Amount	Link to source
N, Nomination Lorentz National reserve	1996	11400.00	
Strategic Planning for the Conservation and Effective Management of Lorentz National Park, Indonesia	2001	30000.00	
Total		41400	

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?

Existing sources of funding are not secure

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

Potential economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed

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

There are some equipment and facilities but overall these are inadequate

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

There is inadequate funds and infrastructures to maintain the whole property.

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

Full-time	96%
Part-time	4%

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

Permanent	96%
Seasonal	4%

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

Paid	80%
Volunteer	20%

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

Human resources are inadequate 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	Poor
Promotion	Poor
Community outreach	Poor
Interpretation	Poor
Education	Poor
Visitor management	Non-existent
Conservation	Poor
Administration	Poor
Risk preparedness	Non-existent
Tourism	Poor
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Poor

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	Low
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	Low
Education	Low
Visitor management	Not available
Conservation	Low
Administration	Medium
Risk preparedness	Low
Tourism	Low
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 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

Lorentz management system is inadequate to cover the 2.35 million hectares. Lack of resources in term of numbers and capacity is the major challenges to maintain huge area of the property.

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 not available

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

there are needs more studies and research projects to increasing scientific/traditional knowledge concerned the property to improve the management and decision-making.

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

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

In **one location** 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	Poor
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	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 **limited and ad hoc** education and awareness programme

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

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

There is need to increase programme related to education, information and awareness in particular for the indigenous people.

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	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
Other

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

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?

There is **some management** of the visitor use of the World Heritage property

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

Although the tourism industry is active in the property, there is **little or no contact** between tourism operators and those responsible for the World Heritage property

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, but it makes **no 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

The fees are collected is given to central government as non taxes state incomes. The central government will use the fees for general development and not directly allocated to strengthen national park management.

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	Average
Local communities	Non-existent
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Excellent
Industry	Poor
Local indigenous peoples	Average

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

Implementation of the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee is ongoing, and also required cooperation from stakeholders to get results as expected.

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

Monitoring needs to be improved and implemented more effectively by involving stakeholders

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
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure					
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	(ix) (x) the road development has affecting ecosystem and biological diversity.	The road development has been stopped.	- Road construction monitoring has been implemented. - Hidrologycal survey has been conducted to measure the road impact.	as soon as possible	- Management body for Lorentz National Park - Government - Province/municipal authority - IUCN - University of Cendrawasih - WWF Indonesia Region Sahul Papua
						The park management together with some NGOs (such as WWF-Indonesia) has worked to convince the local governments especially on the impacts of road construction and other development in and around national parks
3.5	Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production					
3.9	Other human activities					
3.9.1	Illegal activities					
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.3	Drought					
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition					

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones						
	Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.1.4	The boundaries of the World Heritage property are not known by local residents / communities / landowners	The management body for Lorentz National Park (LNP) has organized the socialization of the existence of LNP and its boundaries to stakeholders including the local/indigenous peoples and students who live in/near the area.	annually	- Lorentz National Park - Municipal authority - WWF Indonesia Site Lorentz - Samdhana Institue - Yayasan Bina Adat Walesi		
4.2 Protective Measures						
4.2.5	Major deficiencies in capacity / resources to enforce legislation	LNP has been working with stakeholders to synchronize the various interests and legislation, which is expected to reach the right solution and able to accommodate interests that are based on the principles of preservation of nature.	annually	- Lorentz National Park - Province/Municipal authority - WWF Indonesia Region Sahul Papua		
4.4 Financial and Human Resources						
4.4.4	Existing sources of funding are not secure	LNP & WWF are working on the establishment of sustainable financing institutions, which until now still in the process of feasibility study. The establishment of these institutions is expected to support the budget apart from the state budget (APBN)	5 years	- Lorentz National Park - Province/Municipal authority - WWF Indonesia Region Sahul Papua		

4.4.6	Inadequate equipment and facilities	The management body for LNP has been working with stakeholders to improve the facilities and equipment to support the effective management of protected areas.	annually	- Lorentz National Park - Province/Municipal authority - Samdhana Institute - WWF Indonesia Region Sahul Papua	
4.4.12	Human resources inadequate for management needs	- LNP has sent an application to the directorate general of forest protection and nature conservation on the addition of management staff of LNP - LNP has enhanced cooperation with relevant parties to implement participative management	5 years	- Lorentz National Park - Province/Municipal authority - Samdhana Institute - WWF Indonesia Region Sahul Papua - Yayasan Bina Adat Walesi - Local/indigenous Communities	

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

The authenticity of the World Heritage property has been **preserved**

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 property has sufficient area to preserve species and ecosystems, as well as for conservation of water for the central highlands region of Papua and the southern region of Papua. But it is also a major challenge in implementing a good management of the WHS.

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	Positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	No impact
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	No impact
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Very positive
Legal / Policy framework	Very positive
Lobbying	Positive
Institutional coordination	Very positive
Security	Positive
Other (please specify)	Positive

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

- Needs to be improved cross-sectoral cooperation and coordination through Management Collaboration Forum of LNP. - Also required the consistency from the stakeholders concerned to support the management of TNL - Need to

increase the capacity of institutions, and strengthening the capacity of indigenous peoples in and around the area

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

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

no

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

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

UNESCO	Fair
State Party Representative	Fair
Advisory Body	Fair

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

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

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	Satisfactory

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

• Geographic Information Table

Reason for update: The Committee noted that as per the request of 25 October 1999 from the Indonesian authorities, an adjustment of approximately 150,000 hectares were made to exclude oil exploration concessions in the south-east corner of the Park. The Committee accepted this reduction in the size of the property and agreed with the new boundaries. The modified size of the site is now about 2.35 million hectares.

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

There is need for further assessment questionnaire in order to be more precise in describing the actual conditions.