

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Garajonay National Park

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Spain

Type of Property

natural

Identification Number

380


Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

| Name | Coordinates (latitude/longitude) | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Total (ha) | Inscription year |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Garajonay National Park | 28.126 / -17.237 | 3984 | 4160 | 8144 | 1986 |
| Total (ha) | | 3984 | 4160 | 8144 | |

1.4 - Map(s)

| Title | Date | Link to source |
|---|------------|---|
| Garajonay National Park: Limit of the Park and Peripheral Zone of Protection, scale 1:145,000 | 12/12/2007 |  |

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Elisa de Cabo de la Vega
Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte
Subdirectora de Protección de Patrimonio Histórico
- Laura de Miguel Riera
Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte

Subdirección General de Protección de Patrimonio Histórico
- Esther Rodríguez
Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte
Subdirectora General Adjunta de Protección del Patrimonio Histórico

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Ángel Benito Fernández de López
Garajonay National Park
Director-Conservador
Consejería de Educación, Universidades y Sostenibilidad; Viceconsejería de Medio Ambiente
Dirección general de Protección de la Naturaleza

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- [World Heritage Sites in Spain \(Tourist Office of Spain\)](#)
- [Parque Nacional Garajonay \(Ministerio de Medio Ambiente\)](#)
- [Parque Nacional Garajonay \(Viceconsejería de Medio Ambiente. Gobierno de Canarias\)](#)
- [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](#)

Comment

<http://www.mcu.es/patrimonio/MC/PatrimonioMundial/BienesD ec/ListadoBienes/Garajonay.html>

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

Comment

Garajonay National Park is part of La Gomera Biosphere Reserve. It is a ZEPA (Zone of special protection for birds)

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Comment

The SoOUV is currently under revision by the Advisory Bodies.

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

(vii)(ix)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

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 | |
|---------------|--|-----------|----------|----------|--------|---------|--|--------|--|
| 3.2 | Transportation Infrastructure | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2.1 | Ground transport infrastructure | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2.4 | Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure | | | | | | | | |
| 3.3 | Services Infrastructures | | | | | | | | |
| 3.3.1 | Water infrastructure | | | | | | | | |
| 3.8 | Social/cultural uses of heritage | | | | | | | | |
| 3.8.1 | Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses | | | | | | | | |
| 3.8.4 | Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system | | | | | | | | |
| 3.8.5 | Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community | | | | | | | | |
| 3.8.6 | Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation | | | | | | | | |
| 3.9 | Other human activities | | | | | | | | |
| 3.9.2 | Deliberate destruction of heritage | | | | | | | | |
| 3.10 | Climate change and severe weather events | | | | | | | | |
| 3.10.1 | Storms | | | | | | | | |
| 3.10.3 | Drought | | | | | | | | |
| 3.11 | Sudden ecological or geological events | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | |
| 3.12.5 | Hyper-abundant species | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | |
|-------------|--|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|--------|
| 3.2 | Transportation Infrastructure | | | | | |
| 3.2.4 | Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure | restricted | on-going | minor | low capacity | static |
| 3.3 | Services Infrastructures | | | | | |
| 3.3.1 | Water infrastructure | localised | on-going | significant | low capacity | static |
| 3.8 | Social/cultural uses of heritage | | | | | |
| 3.8.4 | Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system | widespread | on-going | insignificant | medium capacity | static |
| 3.8.5 | Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community | widespread | on-going | minor | low capacity | static |
| 3.8.6 | Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation | restricted | on-going | minor | medium capacity | static |
| 3.9 | Other human activities | | | | | |
| 3.9.2 | Deliberate destruction of heritage | restricted | one off or rare | insignificant | medium capacity | static |
| 3.10 | Climate change and severe weather events | | | | | |
| 3.10.1 | Storms | localised | one off or rare | significant | no capacity and / or resources | static |
| 3.10.3 | Drought | extensive | frequent | significant | no capacity and / or resources | static |
| 3.11 | Sudden ecological or geological events | | | | | |

| | | Spatial scale | Temporal scale | Impact | Management response | Trend |
|---------------|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|--------------|
| 3.11.6 | Fire (wildfires) | extensive | intermittent or sporadic | catastrophic | medium capacity | increasing |
| 3.12 | Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species | | | | | |
| 3.12.1 | Translocated species | localised | on-going | catastrophic | no capacity and / or resources | static |
| 3.12.2 | Invasive/alien terrestrial species | extensive | on-going | significant | medium capacity | static |
| 3.12.5 | Hyper-abundant species | restricted | one off or rare | insignificant | low capacity | static |

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

3.17.1 - Comments

The most important negative factor for the conservation of the site is wildfire. The big fire of 2012 affected 20% of the site area. Although the difficulties to manage this risk is high due to steep topography, extreme meteorological situations and flammable vegetation surrounding the area, it would be of the highest priority to strength the planning and management of the buffer zone in order to decrease fuel flammability, increase social awareness and restore affected areas.

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

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 **do not limit** the ability to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value but they could be improved

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

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property **are adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

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 buffer zones of the World Heritage property **are known** by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

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

The boundaries of the site should be expanded to include different natural areas surrounding the Park that cover different habitat types and species that are not well represented into the National Park.

4.2. Protective Measures

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

The national park was established under Law 3/1981 on 25 March 1981, but the conservation of nature within the national

park area is covered by a number of legal texts, namely: the Law and Regulations on Protected Nature Sites; the Law and Regulations on Forest; the Law and Regulations on Land; the Royal Decrees 485/1962, 3181/1980, 1105/1982, 3091/1982 and Orders of 25 June 1975 and 18 July 1976. The park is within the administrative jurisdiction of ICONA, an independent body within the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. A Director is in charge, with the administration carried out by a management board composed of representatives from local government, universities and ecologists, their duties being circumscribed in law.

The site has a specific legislation as well as a national common legislation for national Parks. In relation with planning the Park has a General Management Plan and specific plans, as for instance endangered species recover plan, etc.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Tuesday, November 8, 2005

• Question 6.02

The site has an specific legislation as well as a national common legislation for national Parks. In relation with planning the Park has a General Management Plan and specific plans, as for instance Endangered species recover plan, etc.

Comment

The national park was established under Law 3/1981 on 25 March 1981, but the management and conservation of the national park area is covered by a number of legal texts, specially National Park law (Ley 5/2007) and Natural Heritage and Biodiversity law (Ley 42/2007). The park is within the administrative jurisdiction of General Direction for Nature Protection of the Canary Government (Dirección General de Protección de la Naturaleza). The Park has a General management Plan and specific plans.

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?

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**

4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

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

4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?

There is **acceptable** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies remain

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

Protection measures should be adapted to the new needs and demands that have arisen the last years. This should be done with the approval of a new Management Plan that is being prepared by the Park administration.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

The park management plan, enacted by Decree 1531/1986 on 30 May 1986 by the Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentacion, and valid for a period of four years, comprises separate sections covering management topics, amongst which are: ecology (ECOPLAN); genetic resources conservation; a plan outline for research on the two endemic bird species, a programme for the eradication of the non-native species and specifically Tradescantia fluminensis; fire prevention; interpretation and education; and recreation provision.

There is a steering group but not related with the World Heritage inscription. It was created by Act in 1981, its name in Spanish is Patronato, and its function is to provide means for social participation to formulate and inform the management decisions and to inform the activities in the buffer zone as well.

The site is managed by the state Party and the management is under protective legislation.

In November 2004 a sentence by the Constitutional Court ordered that the management competence of the site will be under the regional government.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Tuesday, November 8, 2005

• **Question 5.04** Plans in place to set up a "steering group":
There is an steering group but not related with the World Heritage inscription. It was created by Act in 1981, its name in Spanish is Patronato, and its function is to provide means for social participation to formulate and inform the management decisions and to inform the activities in the buffer zone as well.

• **Question 5.05**

Overall management system of the site


- Management by the State Party
- Management under protective legislation
- Other effective management system

In November 2004 a sentence by the Constitutional Court order that the management competence of the site will be under the regional government

Comment

The Park General Management Plan enacted by Decree 1531/1986 on 30 May 1986 is being revised. There is a steering group but not related with the World Heritage inscription. It was created by Act in 1981, its name in Spanish is Patronato, and its function is to provide means for social participation to formulate and inform the management decisions and to inform the activities in the buffer zone as well. The site is managed by the Canary Government.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

| Title | Status | Available | Date | Link to source |
|------------------------------|--------|-----------|------------|---|
| Plan Rector de Uso y Gestion | N/A | Available | 01/01/1985 |  |

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 **only partially** being implemented

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 | Not applicable |
| Landowners | Not applicable |
| Visitors | Fair |
| Researchers | Good |
| Tourism industry | Fair |
| Industry | Not applicable |

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

Local communities **directly contribute** to some decisions relating to management

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

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 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

Cooperation with local people and local authorities in the buffer zone should be increased in fields such as reducing vegetation flammability, sustainable tourism and ecotourism.

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 big fire of 2012 needs a new management approach to restore the affected area and monitor vegetation succession. The European Charter for Sustainable tourism has created a new approach to promote sustainable tourism and ecotourism in cooperation with private enterprises and local authorities. Traditional measures such as control of invasives, restoration of endangered species, visitor planning, environmental education, monitoring, scientific research have received a great progress.

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) | 0% |
| Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State) | 100% |
| Governmental (Local / Municipal) | 0% |
| 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

None.

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

The available budget is **inadequate** for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage

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)?

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

Budget and funding have decreased sustancially in the last years, reducing the capacity to maintain management levels in fields so important as wildfire control, restoration of degraded areas, support to local communities. The programme to expand and maintain visitor facilities is also affected.

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

| | |
|-----------|------|
| Full-time | 100% |
| Part-time | 0% |

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

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Permanent | 35% |
| Seasonal | 65% |

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

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Paid | 98% |
| Volunteer | 2% |

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 | Fair |
| Promotion | Fair |
| Community outreach | Fair |
| Interpretation | Fair |
| Education | Fair |
| Visitor management | Fair |
| 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 | Low |
| Promotion | Medium |
| Community outreach | Medium |
| Interpretation | Medium |
| Education | Medium |

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Visitor management | Medium |
| Conservation | Medium |
| Administration | Medium |
| Risk preparedness | Medium |
| Tourism | Medium |
| Enforcement (custodians, police) | Medium |

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

A capacity development plan or programme is in place and **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

Human resources and its continuity have severely declined in the last years, specially in the field of vegetation management for restoration and wildfire prevention. At least a group of about 14 workers should be included in the staff for this purposes.

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

Angel B. Fernández coord.(2009). Parque Nacional de Garajonay, Patrimonio Mundial. O. A. Parques Nacionales
 Angel B. Fernández, Jose M. Moreno (2004). Parque Nacional de Garajonay, la selva de Canarias. Ed. Turquesa
 Angel B. Fernández coord. (2002): Garajonay National Park, La Gomera. Visitors guide. O. A. Parques Nacionales

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

Research projects related with postfire forest succession, invertebrate biodiversity, forest dyeback, impact of climate change, traditional knowledge should have a high priority in the site.

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

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

In **many locations and easily visible** to visitors

4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Local communities / residents | Average |
| Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property | Average |
| Local Indigenous peoples | Not applicable |
| Local landowners | Not applicable |
| Visitors | Average |
| Tourism industry | Average |
| Local businesses and industries | Average |

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

There is a **planned and effective** education and awareness programme that contributes to the protection of the World Heritage property

4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?

World Heritage status has 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 needed |
| Information booths | Not needed |
| Guided tours | Adequate |
| Trails / routes | Adequate |
| Information materials | Adequate |
| Transportation facilities | Not needed |
| Other | Not needed |

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

Improvements in the interpretation exhibition at the visitor centre, interpretation of the ecological and social impact of wildfires, a new book guide of the site, as well as the maintenance of the existing programs, services and facilities should have high priority in the next years

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 | Decreasing |
| Five years ago | Decreasing |

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

| |
|------------------------------|
| Accommodation establishments |
| Transportation services |
| Tourism industry |
| Visitor surveys |
| Other |

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

The visitor plan includes extensive information about: the offer: natural and cultural values, infrastructure, information, interpretation, marketing and promotion, environmental education, volunteer, security; the demand: number of visitors and typology of the visit, activities, carrying capacity; socioeconomic develop, zonification, normative, programs for infrastructure, information and communication, interpretation, environmental education, security and selfprotection, etc.

4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is **effectively managed** and does not impact its Outstanding Universal Value

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?

No fees are collected

4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property

Cooperation with tourism industry to improve interpretation programs and sustainability and a fee collection strategy for key points such as visitor center should be implemented.

4.8. Monitoring

4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or

improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme** of monitoring, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups

| | |
|--|----------------|
| World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff | Excellent |
| Local / Municipal authorities | Not applicable |
| Local communities | Not applicable |
| Researchers | Average |
| NGOs | Not applicable |
| Industry | Not applicable |
| Local indigenous peoples | Not applicable |

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

Implementation is **complete**

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

No comments.

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

Monitoring of the site must be maintained and adapted to new priorities such as evolution of areas affected by fires, ecology of water streams, anticipation of invasive species and dyeback problems.

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 |
|---------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|------------------------|
| 3.3 | Services Infrastructures | | | | | |
| 3.3.1 | Water infrastructure The extraction of water affects a significant part of the water streams in the Park, which is a key habitat, the most endangered in the Canary Islands. In spite of this, the stream network is the best preserved in the Canaries. | Improve ecological water flow | Monitor changes in water flow | annual | National Park | No additional comments |
| 3.8 | Social/cultural uses of heritage | | | | | |
| 3.8.5 | Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community Changes in local populations are related with the introduction of consumism, emigration, etc. This has reduced pressures on natural resources but at the same time a poorer identification with the site. | Develop an ecodevelopment program for the buffer zone. Reiniciate development investments in the buffere zone. Improve cooperation with local communities and municipalities. | Set a monitoring program for the impacts of this actions. | 4 years | National Park Cabildo Insular Gobierno de Canarias Gobierno Central | No comments |
| 3.10 | Climate change and severe weather events | | | | | |
| 3.10.3 | Drought Some higrophilic species and communities suffer from this drouhts, producing decay and deterioration of its populations, structure, biodiversity, natural processes, etc. | This problem is global. Reduction of global warming emission gases in the activities of the site | Include monitoring activities about climate change and its impacts, such as drought impacts, forest dyeback | 4 years | National Park private enterprises | No comment |
| 3.11 | Sudden ecological or geological events | | | | | |
| 3.11.6 | Fire (wildfires) Wildfires have a man made origin. The laurisilva forest is extremely fragile in relation with fire, beeing recover capacity very limited | Management of the buffer area to reduce flammability and continuity of fuels Management of strategic areas in the park to create areas of low flammability and reduction of fuel charges Improve the capacity of fire teams and renovate fire equipment | Monitor the proposed actions | 4 years | National Park Cabildo Insular Gobierno de Canarias Gobierno Central | No comment |
| 3.12 | Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species | | | | | |
| 3.12.1 | Translocated species Translocation of alien species is forbidden in the National Park | Prevent translocations of invasive species | Monitor that no translocation is produced of invasive species | 4 years | National Park Interested volunteers | No comment |
| 3.12.2 | Invasive/alien terrestrial species In the present, about 4 invasive alien species affect significantly the site. Although some of them have the potential to expanse management actions have improved in good measure this situation, but continuation of managements is needed | Control and maintenance programs | Monitor former actions | 4 years | National Park Volunteer organizations | No comment |

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 |
| 4.1.2 | Boundaries could be improved | It has been prepared a technical proposal to increase the park area in about 25%, in order to cover habitat types that are not well represented into the Park. | The expansion proposal of the Park area do not have a time frame because of difficulties such as private ownership and insufficient implication of local authorities. | National Park Cabildo Insular Canary Government Central Government | No comments |
| 4.4 Financial and Human Resources | | | | | |
| 4.4.3 | The budget is inadequate for management needs | Recover the budget capacity returning funds formerly destined to National Park management and economic development in the buffer zone. | 1 year | Canary Government | No comment |
| 4.4.4 | Existing sources of funding are not secure | Ensure a specific budget for the National Park | 1 year | Canary Government | No comment |
| 4.4.12 | Human resources inadequate for management needs | Ensure a minimum of permanent positions in maintenance personnel | 1 year | Canary Government | No comment |

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 **compromised** by factors described in this report

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property has been **compromised** by factors described in this report

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

Garajonay National Park is the most natural and best representation of relictic ancient laurel forests in the Canaries. In spite of this, the big fire in 2012 badly affected a significant proportion of the site, about 20%, most in the areas worst preserved, although some old growth forests were affected.

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

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

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

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

Recognition from the local level to the global level has been very important. Also, this permits to obtain support for conservation.

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

No suggestions

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

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| UNESCO | Very good |
| State Party Representative | Very good |
| Advisory Body | Very 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 | 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: The SoOUV is currently under revision by the Advisory Bodies.

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

No comments