

## 1. World Heritage Property Data

### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Shiretoko

### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

JapanAsia and the PacificnaturalForestsMarine & coastal11932005


### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Shiretoko	43.949 / 144.966	34100	22100	56200	2005
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>34100</b>	<b>22100</b>	<b>56200</b>	

#### Comment

Coordinates (longitude / latitude) : 145.11.14E / 44.09.36N  
 Property (ha) : 71,100 Total (ha) : 71,100 Japanese Government has already submitted a map which indicates the proposed the boundary of the property on December 26, 2005.

### 1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Location of the Shiretoko World Heritage Nominated Site	30/01/2004	

#### Comment

Japanese Government plans to submit updated map to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2012.

### 1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

#### Comment

The Ministry of the Environment Godochosha No.5, 1-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8975 TEL: +81-3-3581-3351 FAX: +81-3-3591-3228 The Forestry Agency 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8952 TEL: +81-3-3502-8111 FAX: +81-3-3502-2887 The Agency for Cultural Affairs 3-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8959 TEL: +81-3-5253-4111 FAX: +81-3-6734-3822

### 1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Hokkaido Regional Forest office
- Forestry Agency
- Shiretoko Forest Center
- Ministry of Environment
- Kushiro Nature Conservation Office
- Ministry of the Environment
- Utoro Ranger Office for Nature Conservation
- Ministry of the Environment
- Rausu Ranger Office for Nature Conservation

- Forestry Agency  
Abashiri Nambu District Forest Office
- Forestry Agency  
Konsen Tobu District Forest Office
- Forestry Agency  
Utoro Forest Ranger Office
- Forestry Agency  
Rausu Forest Ranger Station
- Forestry Agency  
Minehama Forest Ranger Station
- MIYAKE Yusuke  
Kushiro Nature Conservation Office

#### Comment

Kushiro Nature Conservation Office Noriyuki KATO Address 4F Kishiro National Government Building, 10-3 Saiwai town, Kushiro City, Hokkaido, Japan Japan TEL: +81-154-32-7500 FAX: +81-154-32-7575 Email: NORIYUKI\_KATO@env.go.jp Hokkaido Regional Forest Office Masato KAJIOKA Address 3-7-70 Miyanomori Chuo-ku Sapporo City, Hokkaido, Japan Japan TEL: +81-11-622-5231 FAX: +81-11-622-5194 Email: masato\_kajioka@rinya.maff.go.jp

### 1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](http://dc.shiretoko-whc.com/)

#### Comment

<http://dc.shiretoko-whc.com/>

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

#### Comment

No other designations/Conventions

## 2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

### 2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

#### Comment

Japanese Government has submitted draft Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value on January 31, 2011.

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

(ix)(x)

### 2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Japanese Government has submitted draft Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value on January 31, 2011.

**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
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>					
3.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities						
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>					
3.2.1 Ground transport infrastructure						
3.2.4 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure						
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>					
3.3.4 Localised utilities						
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>					
3.4.1 Pollution of marine waters						
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>					
3.5.1 Fishing/collecting aquatic resources						
3.5.2 Aquaculture						
3.5.3 Land conversion						
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>					
3.8.5 Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community						
3.8.6 Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation						
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>					
3.10.5 Changes to oceanic waters						
3.10.6 Temperature change						
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>					
3.12.2 Invasive/alien terrestrial species						
3.12.3 Invasive / alien freshwater species						
3.12.5 Hyper-abundant species						
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>					
3.13.1 Low impact research / monitoring activities						
3.13.3 Management activities						
<b>Legend</b>	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
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>				
3.2.1 <b>Ground transport infrastructure</b>	restricted	on-going	insignificant	high capacity	increasing
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>				
3.3.4 <b>Localised utilities</b>	localised	on-going	significant	high capacity	decreasing
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>				
3.4.1 <b>Pollution of marine waters</b>	restricted	frequent	insignificant	low capacity	static
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>				
3.5.1 <b>Fishing/collecting aquatic resources</b>	localised	on-going	minor	high capacity	static
3.5.2 <b>Aquaculture</b>	localised	on-going	insignificant	high capacity	static
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>				
3.8.6 <b>Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation</b>	localised	frequent	significant	medium capacity	decreasing
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>				
3.12.2 <b>Invasive/alien terrestrial species</b>	localised	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	increasing
3.12.5 <b>Hyper-abundant species</b>	extensive	on-going	significant	medium capacity	static

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

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

## 4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

### 4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

#### 4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is no buffer zone, and it is not needed

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

National Forests and Natural Parks surrounding the property are managed to avoid any drastic environmental change to the property.

## 4.2. Protective Measures

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

#### Comment

Most of the terrestrial area of the property are the National Forests. The property includes the following protected areas: National Park (designated in 1964; building of new structures, taking of plants and animals, etc. requires permission), Wilderness Area, National Wildlife Protection Area, and Forest Ecosystem Reserve (1990; area in principle left to take its natural course without human intervention), etc. Some species of the wildlife in the site have been designated as Natural Monuments.

### 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

## 4.3. Management System / Management Plan

### 4.3.1 - Management System

#### Comment

The Ministry of the Environment, the Forestry Agency, the Agency for Cultural Affairs, and the Hokkaido Government developed the Management Plan for the Heritage Site and manage the property integrally on the basis of the plan. The Regional Liaison Committee was established and promotes conservation management through collaboration and cooperation with the local community. The Scientific Council was established and promotes adaptive conservation management that reflects scientific knowledge.

### 4.3.2 - Management Documents

#### Comment

Management Plan for the Shiretoko World Natural Heritage Site The Multiple Use Integrated Marine Management Plan The Sika Deer Management Plan in the Shiretoko Peninsula Basic Plan on the Proper Use of the Apical Region of the Peninsula Zone of Shiretoko National Park Basic Plan on the Proper Use of the Central Region of the Peninsula Zone of Shiretoko National Park

**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	Good
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Good
Visitors	Fair
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 **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?**

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

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

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

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

Working groups have been established under the Scientific Council to consider on the basis of scientific evidence and measures to address various issues are being taken in consideration of the views and opinions of local stakeholders. The Sika Deer Management Plan in the Shiretoko Peninsula, the Multiple Use Integrated Marine Management Plan and the Management Plan for the Shiretoko World Natural Heritage Site that integrates all individual plans were formulated.

**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**

**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)	78%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	10%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	12%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
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)**

**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 **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 **some** adequate equipment and facilities, but deficiencies in at least one key area **constrain** management at the World Heritage property

**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**

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

Full-time	86%
Part-time	14%

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

Permanent	86%
Seasonal	14%

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

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

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

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

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

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

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

**No capacity** development plan or programme is in place; management is implemented by external staff and skills are not transferred

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

**4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects**

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

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

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

There is **considerable** research but it is **not directed** towards 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**

Makino M, Matsuda H, Sakurai Y (2009) Expanding Fisheries Co-management to Ecosystem-based management: A case in the Shiretoko World Natural Heritage, Japan. Marine Policy, 33: 207-214. There are many other papers about the Shiretoko World Heritage.

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

On the basis of discussions at the Scientific Council meetings, relevant administrative organisations, local governments, related bodies, and experts are collaborating to conduct research and studies and accumulate scientific knowledge.

**4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building**

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

Not displayed at all

**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	Excellent
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Excellent
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Excellent

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

There is a **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 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?**

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

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

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

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

We have created an emblem of the Shiretoko World Natural Heritage site and are disseminating and promoting our activities in conservation and management.

**4.7. Visitor Management**

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

Last year	Decreasing
Two years ago	Decreasing
Three years ago	Decreasing
Four years ago	Decreasing
Five years ago	Decreasing

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

Entry tickets and registries
Accommodation establishments
Transportation services
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys
Other

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**Comment**

Basic Plan on the Proper Use of the Central Region of Shiretoko National Park Basic Plan on the Proper Use of the Apical Region of Shiretoko National Park

**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**

We have set up a Committee on Proper Use of Nature and Ecotourism (the participants in which include academic experts, relevant administrative organisations, and concerned local bodies) to develop and review the necessary plans and rules of use in order to hand down pristine natural environments to future generations by promoting the appropriate use of nature and ecotourism.

**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 considerable monitoring but it is **not directed towards 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	Non-existent
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Excellent
Industry	Average
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

**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**

Japanese Government has submitted "Information on the progress made with the implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 monitoring mission of Shiretoko (Intermediate report)" in July 2011.

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

In the Scientific Council, we are deliberating a monitoring plan to evaluate whether the values of the World Heritage site are maintained as expected.

**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
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>					
<b>3.2.1</b>	<b>Ground transport infrastructure</b>					
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>					
<b>3.3.4</b>	<b>Localised utilities</b>	(ix) (x) Salmonids which fulfill an important role in linking the marine and terrestrial ecosystems.	In accordance with the advice of the River Construction Working Group of the Scientific Council, we judged that 13 constructions should be modified with priority. Consequently, we are currently modifying them successively.	We are monitoring the escapement and spawning of salmonid species after the modifications of constructions.	Modifications to the 13 constructions are planned to be completed by the end of Fiscal Year 2011. Monitoring will be continued for 3 years after completion of the modifications.	The Forestry Agency and Hokkaido Prefecture.
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>					
<b>3.5.1</b>	<b>Fishing/collecting aquatic resources</b>	(ix) (x) Chum salmon, pink salmon, and masu salmon ( <i>Oncorhynchus masou masou</i> ).	We have developed the Multiple Use Integrated Marine Management Plan based on laws and regulations regarding fisheries and on voluntary management, and are using aquatic resources in a sustainable way, conserving the marine ecosystem.	We have chosen indicator species that characterises the marine ecosystem of Shiretoko, and are monitoring the marine ecosystem.	We will continue to promote conservation and management in accordance with the Multiple Use Integrated Marine Management Plan.	The Ministry of the Environment and Hokkaido Prefecture. They are promoting conservation and management of marine area in collaboration with relevant local bodies such as the fishery cooperatives.
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>					
<b>3.8.6</b>	<b>Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation</b>	(ix) (x) Fragile vegetation in areas such as the alpine zone and marshes.	We have performed various things, such as introduction of regulated utilization area, development of the Basic Plan for Proper Use, and dissemination of Guidance for Nature Use. We are deliberating on the "Ecotourism Strategy" from 2010.	We are monitoring the behaviors of visitors and their impacts on vegetation.	We are planning to complete the development of the Ecotourism Strategy by the end of Fiscal Year 2012.	The Ministry of the Environment, the Forestry Agency, and Hokkaido Prefecture. They are promoting proper use and ecotourism in cooperation with the two local towns (Shari and Rausu) and concerned local bodies.
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>					
<b>3.12.2</b>	<b>Invasive/alien terrestrial species</b>	(ix) The heritage site's ecosystem.	We are taking measures to eliminate and control bull thistle, racoons, large earth bumblebees, etc. and are raising public awareness of these activities.	We are monitoring the situations of invasion and expansions of distribution.	We will continue taking these measures.	The Ministry of the Environment. The Ministry is taking these measures in cooperation with Hokkaido Prefecture and the two local towns.
<b>3.12.5</b>	<b>Hyper-abundant species</b>	(ix) The ecosystem and natural landscape.	In accordance with the advice of the Sika Deer and Terrestrial Ecosystem Working Group of the Scientific Council, we are controlling the population of sika deer and are setting up protective fences for vegetation.	We are monitoring the status of vegetation restoration and the population of sika deer.	We plan to review the Sika Deer Management Plan in the Shiretoko Peninsula by the end of Fiscal Year 2011 and to decide on future directions.	The Ministry of the Environment. The Ministry is taking these measures in cooperation with the Forestry Agency, Hokkaido Prefecture, and the two local towns.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.4 Financial and Human Resources					
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
4.4.15	<b>No capacity development plan or programme is in place</b>	We are holding briefing sessions and lectures for local residents. In addition, school education regarding the World Heritage site is provided in the two local towns, Shari and Rausu.	We plan to deliberate on the need to develop plans or programs to improve managerial ability at Shiretoko.	The Ministry of the Environment, the Forestry Agency, and Hokkaido Prefecture.	
4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building					
4.6.1	<b>World Heritage emblem not displayed</b>	We have independently created the emblem of the Shiretoko World Natural Heritage site and are displaying it in various places.	We plan to deliberate on the need to display the World Heritage emblem.	The Ministry of the Environment, the Forestry Agency, and Hokkaido Prefecture.	
4.6.3	<b>There is a limited education and awareness programme</b>	Education and lectures on the rules are provided to visitors, and lectures, etc. for local residents are also provided. In addition, an educational program on the values of the World Heritage site is provided for residents of the two local towns.	We plan to deliberate on the implementation of a systematic educational and awareness program.	The Ministry of the Environment, the Forestry Agency, and Hokkaido Prefecture. These organisations are working on this issue in collaboration with the two local towns, i.e. Shari and Rausu.	

**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 **impacted** by factors described in this report, but this situation is being **addressed through effective management actions**.

**5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values**

Other important cultural and / or natural values are being **partially degraded** but the state of conservation of the World Heritage property has not been significantly impacted

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

**5.4.1 - Comments**

**6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise**

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

Conservation	Positive
Research and monitoring	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Very positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Very positive
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Positive
Institutional coordination	Very positive
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
External experts

**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**

It is hoped the terms in the questions should be defined clearly.

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

UNESCO	Fair
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Fair

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

All required information was accessible

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

The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The 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

**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**

- **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**  
Reason for update: Japanese Government has submitted draft Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value on January 31, 2011.
- **Geographic Information Table**  
Reason for update: Coordinates (longitude / latitude) : 145.11.14E / 44.09.36N Property (ha) : 71,100 Total (ha) : 71,100 Japanese Government has already submitted a map which indicates the proposed the boundary of the property on December 26, 2005.
- **Map(s)**  
Reason for update: Japanese Government plans to submit updated map to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2012.

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