

World Heritage

reports

44



World Heritage in the High Seas: An Idea Whose Time Has Come



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



World
Heritage
Convention



World Heritage in the High Seas: An Idea Whose Time Has Come

July 2016

Published in 2016 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,
7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP, France

© UNESCO 2016

ISBN 978-92-3-100159-8



This publication is available in Open Access under the Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO (CC-BY-SA 3.0 IGO) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/igo/>). By using the content of this publication, the users accept to be bound by the terms of use of the UNESCO Open Access Repository (<http://www.unesco.org/open-access/terms-use-ccbysa-en>).

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO or IUCN concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The ideas and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors; they are not necessarily those of UNESCO or IUCN and do not commit the Organization.

Authors:

David Freestone, Lead Project Consultant
Dan Laffoley, Vice-Chair Marine, WCPA, IUCN
Fanny Douvère, Coordinator, World Heritage Marine Programme, UNESCO
Tim Badman, Director, World Heritage Programme, IUCN

Special advisers:

Patrick Halpin, Director, Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab, Duke University
Kristina Gjerde, Senior Advisor High Seas, IUCN
David Obura, Director, CORDIO East Africa

Cover credits: A juvenile of the neustonic chondrophore *Porpita porpita*. © Sönke Johnsen

Images from Shutterstock do not fall under the CC-BY-SA licence and may not be used or reproduced without the prior permission of the copyright holders.

Editing:

Julie Wickenden

Graphic Design:

Aurelia Mazoyer, UNESCO/MSS/CLD/D

Original layout: Recto Verso

UNESCO World Heritage Centre coordination:

Fanny Douvère
Robbert Casier

Coordinator of the World Heritage Paper Series:

Vesna Vujcic-Lugassy

Printed in France

This publication was made possible thanks to the support of the Khaled bin Sultan Living Oceans Foundation, the French Marine Protected Areas Agency and ongoing support of the Swiss watch manufacture Jaeger-LeCoultre. Additional support was provided by the Nekton Foundation.

In collaboration with



With the support of



With the additional support of



With the ongoing support of



Foreword



Dr Mechtild Rössler,
Director of the World Heritage Centre.
© UNESCO

Just as on land, the deepest and most remote ocean harbours globally unique places that deserve recognition, just as we have given to the Grand Canyon National Park in the United States of America, to the Galápagos Islands in Ecuador or the Serengeti National Park of the United Republic of Tanzania. 70% of our planet is covered with ocean. Nearly two-thirds of the ocean lies beyond the jurisdiction of nations. The open ocean is a vast majestic place that covers half our globe.

Imagine a world with sunken fossilized islands covered in a great diversity of corals and other marine life, giant volcanoes forming vast seamounts that can all but dwarf the tallest mountains on land, a 'floating golden rainforest' on the ocean surface with its own unique creatures, or even a deep dark place with 60-metre-high white spires of rock that looks like a lost city beneath the waves.

Some of these places are not even powered by the light of the sun, like everything else on Earth, but by heat and energy emerging from the Earth and the ocean ridges, that has created some of the most exceptional ecosystems and species – most still unknown to science. Unique forms of life so extreme they form pivotal case studies for space agencies and others, providing critical analogues to help plan future missions to distant planets to search for life or spur innovation for the next generation of disease treatments. All these, and more, are found in the 'High Seas' and the deep seabed – which together we call Marine Areas beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ), lying as they do outside the territory of any single nation.

The purpose of this publication is to consider how such exceptional sites could be afforded the same level of recognition and protection that we are currently able to give to natural and cultural sites under the 1972 World Heritage Convention.¹ The reason we do not already do so is largely a result of past history but now is the time to expand our horizons and bring such areas into consideration for their potential Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).

In 1972, when the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage was adopted, international environmental law was at a very early stage. The Convention was then, and still is, highly innovative. Its unique and uncompromising vision is set out in the Preamble which states that 'parts of the cultural or natural heritage are of outstanding interest and therefore need to be preserved as part of the *world heritage of mankind as a whole*.'² It highlights the fact that existing international instruments 'demonstrate the importance, for all the peoples of the world, of safeguarding this unique and irreplaceable property, *'to whatever people it may belong*.'³

Nothing in this inspirational vision suggests that natural or cultural heritage of OUV which is located in ABNJ should be excluded from this protection. Indeed, under the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), the High Seas are waters that are open to all and that may not be subjected to the sovereignty of any state – they are the

1 UNESCO (1972) Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage adopted by the General Conference at its 17th session, Paris, 16 November 1972: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/>

2 Preamble, operative paragraph 6. Francioni has pointed out that it forges an unprecedented link between culture and nature and uses the concept of 'World Heritage' to list sites that are of paramount value to 'mankind as a whole' because of their 'outstanding universal value'. In: Francioni, F. and Lenzerini, F. (eds), 2008, *The 1972 World Heritage Convention: a Commentary*, OUP, pp. 3-4.

3 Preamble, operative paragraph 5.

global commons. It is difficult to imagine that the founders' far-sighted vision of World Heritage protection envisaged a future world where we intentionally or accidentally ended up excluding half the surface of the earth – the open ocean.

Nevertheless, the practicalities of nominating, assessing and inscribing sites has put the primary obligation on the states within whose territories they are situated. This publication shows that the time has come to remedy this historical oversight. It argues, with some vivid illustrations, that there are many sites of potential OUV in ABNJ. The original vision of the 1972 Convention appears to encompass these sites, but they have been neglected in the development of the procedural means by which inscription and protection takes place.

The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) is now looking with renewed interest at the importance of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity of ABNJ. The World Heritage Convention has protected sites of OUV for over 40 years and has the potential to play a key role in this agenda, identifying sites which are the equivalent of the charismatic sites on land such as the Okavango Delta or the Grand Canyon National Park, although by definition far from land and often deep beneath the ocean.

This publication responds to the independent audit recommendations of the May 2011 *Evaluation of the Global Strategy and the PACT initiative*⁴ that States Parties to the Convention should reflect on means to preserve sites that correspond to conditions of OUV which are not dependent upon the sovereignty of States Parties.

This publication has three main parts. Part One looks at the context of this recommendation and discusses how this work contributes to efforts currently being undertaken under the auspices of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Part Two looks at the way in which the concept of OUV could be applied in ABNJ and provides a short illustrative collection of sites in ABNJ of which there is sufficient scientific knowledge to make an informed assessment of their potential OUV. Part Three of this publication then discusses the legal basis under the Convention for such a development and lays out the possible modalities toward World Heritage sites in the High Seas.

The far-sighted vision of the 1972 World Heritage Convention's founders of safeguarding our unique and irreplaceable heritage of humanity, *to whatever people it may belong*, the 2011 audit recommendations that first recognized the need to reflect on OUV in areas beyond national jurisdiction, and in 2016, the beginning of the negotiations of a new agreement for the protection of biodiversity in ABNJ under the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, all underline that World Heritage in the High Seas is indeed an idea whose time has come.



Dr. Mechtild Rössler
Director of the Division for Heritage and the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO

4 WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A. Paris, 27 May 2011. <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2011/whc11-35com-9Ae1.pdf>

Acknowledgements



This publication would not have been possible without the leadership of His Royal Highness Prince Khaled bin Sultan and the generous support of the Khaled bin Sultan Living Oceans Foundation. The initiative also received support from the French Marine Protected Areas Agency (AAMP) and the Nekton Foundation. It is, however, thanks to the enduring support by the Swiss watch manufacture Jaeger-LeCoultre to the World Heritage Marine Programme that innovative and inspiring work such as that reflected in this publication becomes reality.

This publication has benefited considerably from inputs received by participants at the High Seas expert meeting convened at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris on 29-30 October 2015 and extensive consultations with recognized leading experts in the field of policy, legislation, ecology and geology of ABNJ and World Heritage. The annexes include a list of specialists who took part in the technical expert meeting and reviewed, or contributed to, this publication.

Abbreviations

AAMP	Agence des aires marines protégées
ABNJ	Areas beyond National Jurisdiction
BBNJ	Biodiversity beyond National Jurisdiction
BPA	Benthic Protection Area
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCAD	Central American Commission on Environment and Development
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CNRS	Centre national de la recherche scientifique
COCATRAM	Comisión Centroamericana de Transporte Marítimo
CORDIO	Coastal Oceans Research and Development – Indian Ocean
EBSA	Ecologically or Biologically Significant Area
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IATTC	Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission
ICCAT	International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas
IMMA	Important Marine Mammal Area
IOC	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission
IODE	International Oceanographic Data and Information Exchange Programme
ISA	International Seabed Authority
ITLOS	International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
IUU	Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated fishing
IWC	International Whaling Commission
MPA	Marine Protected Area
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NERC	Natural Environment Research Council
NIWA	National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research Ltd
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NSF	National Science Foundation, USA
OSPESCA	Central American Fisheries and Aquaculture Organization
OUV	Outstanding Universal Value
RFMO	Regional Fisheries Management Organization
ROV	Remotely Operated Vehicle
SIODFA	Southern Indian Ocean Deepwater Fishers Association
SPAW	Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife
SPRFMO	South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNICPOLOS	United Nations Informal Consultative Process on the Oceans and the Law of the Sea
VME	Vulnerable Marine Ecosystem

Table of Contents

Foreword.....	4
Acknowledgements.....	6
Abbreviations.....	7
Executive summary.....	11

1 Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas: why does it matter?.....13



1. What are the 'High Seas'?	14
2. Marine areas currently protected under the 1972 World Heritage Convention.....	15
3. The Bahrain Action Plan and the IUCN Marine Gap Analysis.....	16
4. The External Audit recommendation on the implementation of the Global Strategy of the 1972 World Heritage Convention.....	18
5. Developments at the United Nations General Assembly.....	20
6. Future collaboration.....	22

2 Potential Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas.....23



1. Introduction.....	24
2. Outstanding Universal Value: the concept that underpins World Heritage.....	25
3. The criteria that determine Outstanding Universal Value.....	27
4. Illustrations of potential Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas.....	29
The Lost City Hydrothermal Field.....	32
The Costa Rica Thermal Dome.....	34
The White Shark Café.....	36
The Sargasso Sea.....	38
The Atlantis Bank.....	40

3 Recognizing and protecting Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas: how could it work in practice?43



1. Introduction	44
2. The World Heritage Convention text: an inclusive vision	45
3. Provisions for nominating World Heritage sites	47
4. Possible options for applying Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas	49
4.1. Introduction	
4.2. A 'bold' interpretation of the 1972 World Heritage Convention	50
4.3. Amendment outside the terms of the 1972 World Heritage Convention	51
4.4. An optional protocol to the 1972 World Heritage Convention	51
5. Management and protection of Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas	52
6. Concluding remarks	55

4 Annexes57



Annex I References	58
Annex II Expert Working Meeting, 29-30 October 2015: agenda and participants	66
Annex III List of interviewees, contributors and reviewers	69

5 Appendices (available online only: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/marine-programme>)



- Appendix 1 The Lost City Hydrothermal Field
- Appendix 2 The Costa Rica Thermal Dome
- Appendix 3 The White Shark Café
- Appendix 5 The Sargasso Sea
- Appendix 6 The Atlantis Bank

Executive summary

Oceans cover 70% of our planet. Nearly two-thirds of it lies beyond the jurisdiction of nations. These marine areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ) cover half our planet. They contain natural wonders equivalent to those on land such as the Grand Canyon National Park in the United States of America, the Galápagos Islands in Ecuador or the Serengeti National Park of the United Republic of Tanzania. They include sunken fossilized islands covered in a staggering diversity of corals and other marine life, giant volcanoes forming vast seamounts that could only dwarf the tallest mountains on land, a ‘floating golden rainforest’ on the ocean surface with its own unique creatures, or even a deep dark place with 60-metre-high white spires of rock that looks like a lost city beneath the waves. These unique conditions have also given birth to the most unusual species – many still unknown to science. Unique forms of life so extreme they form pivotal case studies for space agencies and others, providing critical analogues to help plan future missions to distant planets in search for life or spur innovation for the next generation of disease treatments.

Nothing in the inspirational vision contained in the 1972 UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage suggests that natural or cultural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) located in areas outside national jurisdiction should be excluded from its protection. In 2011, an independent external audit on the Global Strategy of the 1972 World Heritage Convention recommended that the World Heritage Committee reflect on appropriate means to preserve sites that correspond to conditions of OUV which are not dependent upon the sovereignty of States. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine that the Convention’s founders’ far-sighted vision of protection envisaged a future world where we intentionally or accidentally ended up excluding half the surface of the Earth – the open ocean.

This publication is a response to the audit recommendation and shows that the time has indeed come to remedy this historical oversight. It argues, with some vivid illustrations, that there are many sites of potential OUV in areas beyond national jurisdiction. The original vision of the 1972 Convention appears to encompass these sites, but they have been neglected in the development of the procedural means by which inscription takes place. This publication takes a systematic approach to illustrating potential OUV in marine ABNJ, mindful that the purpose is not to produce an official tentative list of sites but rather to demonstrate through a small number of illustrations the need for, and the urgency of, extending the provisions of the Convention to the other half of the planet, and to illustrate a sample of the variety of differing types of potential OUV that exist in the open ocean and seabed beyond national jurisdiction.

Further, the publication explores the mechanisms by which the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention could consider implementing changes to allow the inscription and protection of sites in marine ABNJ on the UNESCO World Heritage List. It does not recommend any particular approach but does seek to explore briefly the arguments for and against each, recognizing that not all of these options are equally practicable. In short, there are realistically three possible modalities: 1) Bold interpretation of the Convention, either through incremental change or a formal policy change; 2) Amendment outside the terms of the 1972 Agreement akin to the 1994 Part XI Implementing Agreement to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS); and 3) An optional protocol to the 1972 Convention, developed through an international negotiation among States Parties, binding only those States that choose to ratify any resulting protocol.

Finally, the publication highlights the fact that in 2016 the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) started a process leading to the negotiation of a legally binding instrument under UNCLOS on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in ABNJ. This process is separate from discussions within the World Heritage Convention’s network but strongly underlines the fact that World Heritage in the High Seas is indeed ‘an idea whose time has come’.

PART I
Outstanding Universal
Value in the High Seas:
why does it matter?

1



The pelagic bolitaenid octopus *Japattella diaphana*
© Sönke Johnsen

1. What are the ‘High Seas’?



Uniquely beautiful jellyfish observed while exploring the informally named “Enigma Seamount” at a depth of 3,700 metres. Image courtesy of NOAA Office of Ocean Exploration and Research, 2016 Deepwater Exploration of the Marianas.


For the purpose of this publication, the term ‘marine areas beyond national jurisdiction’ is used to describe both seabed areas beyond national jurisdiction as well as the water column above them more than 200 nautical miles from the coast. The ocean area is commonly referred to as the ‘High Seas’. This area covers nearly 50% of the Earth.

Previous reports quoted in this publication have used the terms ABNJ (areas beyond national jurisdiction) and ‘High Seas’ interchangeably – which is not strictly correct. ABNJ

include High Seas but also the seabed beyond national continental shelves.

For the purpose of this publication, the focus is on areas and natural features of possible Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) lying outside marine areas under national jurisdiction. Throughout this publication, both the concepts ‘marine areas beyond national jurisdiction’ and ‘High Seas’ are used. They refer thus only to marine areas and exclude for example the whole of the Antarctic continent.

2. Marine areas currently protected under the 1972 World Heritage Convention



The 47 marine sites inscribed on the World Heritage List (June 2016).
© UNESCO

Since the inscription of the first truly marine site on UNESCO's World Heritage List in 1981, marine features and sites protected under the World Heritage Convention have grown into a global network that stretches from the tropics to the poles. As of June 2016, the UNESCO World Heritage List counts 47 marine sites located in 36 nations. The collection of sites includes global icons such as the Great Barrier Reef in Australia, the Tubbataha Reefs Natural Park in the Philippines or Galápagos Islands in Ecuador.

With the inscription of Papahānaumokuākea (United States of America) and Phoenix Islands Protected Area (Kiribati), the total surface of marine areas protected under the World Heritage Convention has more than doubled since 2010. World Heritage marine sites now cover about 10% of all marine protected areas on Earth by surface area.

3. The Bahrain Action Plan and the IUCN Marine Gap Analysis



A sponge covered with hundreds to thousands of tiny anemones also provides a home to several brittlestars (pink), crinoids or “sea lilies” (yellow), and a basket star (brown),
Image courtesy of the NOAA Office of Ocean Exploration and Research, 2015 Hohonu Moana.

In 2007, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and its World Commission on Protected Areas hosted an international Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) Summit in Washington DC that resulted in a global Plan of Action, within which Marine World Heritage was identified as a key global strategic priority. As a result of the MPA Summit, in 2010 IUCN collaborated with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization’s (UNESCO) World Heritage Centre, the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage and other partners in developing the *Bahrain Action Plan for Marine World Heritage*.⁵ This plan

was specifically developed to ensure that marine areas of OUV were accorded equal attention to World Heritage on land and to help ensure balance and proportional action for marine sites under the Convention.

Part of the Bahrain Action Plan highlighted what it called the ‘*reality of application of the World Heritage Convention*’ which is that it is currently being applied to just half the world’s surface. The remaining 50% is covered by the High Seas, areas of ocean beyond the responsibility of any individual country, which remain unrecognized under the Convention. These marine areas have features of potential OUV that are found nowhere else on Earth. The Plan acknowledged that in the coming years mechanisms will be found to protect the wildlife, habitats and value of ABNJ and recommended that ‘to “future-proof” the Convention

⁵ Laffoley, D. and Langley, J. 2010. *Bahrain Action Plan for Marine World Heritage. Identifying Priorities and enhancing the role of the World Heritage Convention in the IUCN-WCPA Marine Global Plan of Action for MPAs in our Oceans and Seas. Switzerland, IUCN.* <http://whc.unesco.org/document/105357>

*it is critical that actions now commence to consider what might be protected in the open ocean and deep sea beyond national jurisdiction so that when mechanisms are identified, there is information available of how the Convention can play a similar role to the one it has played for areas currently under its jurisdiction.'*⁶

This proposed approach was vindicated in 2013 by a major thematic study on Marine World Heritage by IUCN – whose special role is recognized as an official advisory body for natural World Heritage under the World Heritage Convention.⁷ That study concluded that:

The World Heritage Convention is currently not applied to Areas beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ), which constitute about 60–66% of the ocean's surface, i.e. most of this three-dimensional biome, and which contain a number of unique and exceptional natural heritage values that know no national boundaries. The high seas undoubtedly include areas that would be regarded as meeting the natural World Heritage criteria. This has resulted in a significant gap that States Parties may wish to fill and has the potential to be addressed by developing a specific process for the selection, nomination, evaluation, and management of such marine World Heritage sites, consistent with international law as reflected in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). Ongoing discussions at the United Nations on a possible new instrument under UNCLOS for conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in ABNJ could provide a possible vehicle to address this gap.⁸

The High Seas were further highlighted as an important gap in the UNESCO World Heritage List in the study *Marine World Heritage: Toward a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List*. The study used methods such as the marine ecoregions of the world and pelagic provinces of the world classification as designed by UNESCO's Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) in view of applying a systematic approach toward identifying gaps in the ocean.⁹



An unidentified blue shrimp, likely from near-surface waters.
© Sönke Johnson

“To ‘future-proof’ the Convention it is critical that actions now commence to consider what might be protected in the open ocean and deep sea beyond national jurisdiction so that the Convention can play a similar role to the one it has played for areas currently under its jurisdiction”

(2010 Bahrain Action Plan)

⁶ Para 3.3.7.(b) continued ‘...it was also felt that further exploration, in a similar vein, could be turned to how the Convention might interface with other international instruments and institutions. ...International instruments of relevance include: Ramsar Convention, Convention on Biological Diversity and its Programme of Works on Protected Areas (CBD POWPA), Convention on Conservation of Antarctic Living Marine Resources (CCAMLR) and the Madrid Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty regarding Environmental Protection, the International Seabed Authority, the Migratory Species Convention, the regional seas conventions and agreements (e.g. OSPAR, Cartagena, Nairobi), International Maritime Organization (and designation of Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas), among others.’

⁷ *Marine Natural Heritage and the World Heritage List interpretation of World Heritage criteria in marine systems, analysis of biogeographic representation of sites, and a roadmap for addressing gaps*, IUCN 2013. The special role of IUCN is recognized in Articles 8(3) and 13(7), World Heritage Convention.

⁸ The report continued ‘Although high seas and deep ocean areas suffer from a severe lack of information that may impede some analyses of potential OUV, data collection and analysis conducted by experts for the CBD-facilitated regional workshops to describe EBSAs offer a new and rich overview of potential MWHs.’ See further below.

⁹ Spalding, M. 2012. *Marine World Heritage: Toward a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List*. World Heritage Centre, Paris, UNESCO.

4. The External Audit recommendation on the implementation of the Global Strategy of the 1972 World Heritage Convention¹⁰



Thirty-eighth Session of the World Heritage Committee (Doha, 2014).
© UNESCO/Eric Esquivel

In 1994, the World Heritage Committee launched a Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List. By balanced it refers to 'representativity' among bio-geographical regions or events in the history of life and credibility concerns not only the number of sites inscribed, but the representativeness of sites from the different regions of the world and stages of the Earth's history. It refers in particular to the quality of management in designated World Heritage sites and the ability to address threats and dangers to bring them back to their normal conditions, if needed.¹¹ The Global Strategy aimed to avoid an overrepresentation of a small selection of regions or categories and to ensure that the World Heritage List reflects the broad diversity of the world's cultural and natural areas of OUV. Efforts to

encourage nomination of properties from categories and regions currently not or largely underrepresented on the World Heritage List are crucial to implementing the Global Strategy.

To support implementation of the Global Strategy, the World Heritage Committee established the UNESCO World Heritage Marine Programme at the 29th session of the Committee held in 2005 in South Africa. The objective of the World Heritage Marine Programme was to ensure that all marine sites with existing or potential OUV are protected effectively and that they cover all major marine regions and marine ecosystem types in a balanced, credible and representative manner.

Successful global representation of exceptional marine features on the World Heritage List requires a thorough understanding of what is covered already and where other areas of OUV are that should be added. Essentially, all major marine regions and marine ecosystem types should be represented.

Despite the fact that marine areas covered under the World Heritage Convention has doubled since the inception of the

¹⁰ The General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention at its 17th session requested the World Heritage Centre to provide the General Assembly at its 18th session in 2011 'with a summary of the work undertaken in relation to the reflection on the future of the Convention, including an independent evaluation by UNESCO's external auditor on the implementation of the Global Strategy from its inception in 1994 to 2011 and the Partnerships for Conservation Initiative (PACT), based on indicators and approaches to be developed during the 34th and 35th sessions of the World Heritage Committee.'

¹¹ WHC-96/CONF.202/INF.9. Paris, 15 April 1996. <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/1996/whc-96-conf202-inf9e.pdf>

World Heritage Marine Programme, an external audit on the implementation of the Global Strategy¹² concluded that:

There are zones, such as the High Seas (part of the Arctic) and the Antarctic, to which the World Heritage Convention does not apply, zones that escape the sovereignty of States Parties. As the action plan for Marine World Heritage adopted in 2009 in Bahrain underlines, 50% of marine areas are located in the High Seas. If the Antarctic Treaty (1959) offers a collaborative workable mechanism focused on ocean conservation for that region, it is appropriate that States establish without delay workable provisions adapted for the High Seas, of which the natural heritage long preserved due to its isolation and the difficulty in exploiting its resources, is now threatened. The Bahrain expert workshop recommended establishing a list of sites of the High Seas that fulfilled the OUV criteria in order to give impetus to progress through the framework of the Convention on the Law of the Sea or the Convention on Migratory Species to better argue an eventual extension of the World Heritage Convention.

In its final independent evaluation report to the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention on the implementation of the World Heritage Global Strategy from its inception in 1994 to 2011, the UNESCO External Auditor recommended (in Recommendation No. 5 of the Audit) that the World Heritage Committee should:

‘Reflect on appropriate means to preserve sites that correspond to conditions of outstanding universal value, which are not dependent upon the sovereignty of States Parties.’¹³

This is in light of the fact that the open ocean is a considerable proportion of the Earth’s surface which has yet to receive consideration under this global Convention. This publication responds to that invitation to reflect on appropriate means by which the World Heritage regime might preserve sites of potential OUV in marine ABNJ.

“It is appropriate that States establish without delay workable provisions adapted for the High Seas of which the natural heritage long preserved due to its isolation and the difficulty in exploiting its resources, is now threatened”

(2011 External Audit on the implementation of the Global Strategy)

¹² WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A. Paris, 27 May 2011, p. 24. <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2011/whc11-35com-9Ae1.pdf>

¹³ WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A. Paris, 27 May 2011, p. 24. <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2011/whc11-35com-9Ae1.pdf>

5. Developments at the United Nations General Assembly



A view of the Assembly Hall as Sam Kutesa (on screens), President of the sixty-ninth session of the Assembly, chairs the meeting. 19 June 2015. Adoption UNGA/RES/69/292
© UN Photo/Rick Bajornas

In 2004, the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) had agreed to the recommendation of the United Nations Informal Consultative Process on the Oceans and the Law of the Sea (UNICPOLOS) to establish an Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group to study issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction. This Working Group on biodiversity beyond national jurisdiction (BBNJ) has been meeting since then to assess the risks to biodiversity in ABNJ and to assess the need for a new instrument, perhaps in the form of a third Implementing Agreement to the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, to address *lacunae* in the existing system of High Seas governance.

Issues highlighted in the discussions have included the absence of a global instrument regulating the establishment and monitoring of MPAs in ABNJ (even though protected areas have proven to be extremely effective in maintaining biodiversity in coastal contexts), the absence of comprehensive environmental impact assessments (EIAs) for new activities in ABNJ, as well as the lack of coordination between those international organizations that are charged with regulating specific sectoral activities, including regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs). In January 2015, the BBNJ Working Group finalized recommendations to the UNGA to 'develop an international legally-binding instrument under the Law of the Sea Convention on the

conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction.’¹⁴

Moreover, despite the fact that the deep seabed is formally declared to be the ‘*common heritage of mankind*’ and that the High Seas are open to all, there is increasingly global recognition that marine ABNJ are an important and to date rather neglected aspect of the legal regime for the oceans. Awareness of the value of the ocean in general is no longer confined to just nearshore areas, reefs or beaches, and now extends to open ocean areas and features in ABNJ such as seamounts, cold water corals and hydrothermal vents, even ship wrecks, as well as critical habitats for marine migratory species.

After a decade of discussion, on 19 June 2015, the UNGA -- following a recommendation of the BBNJ working Group from January 2015 -- adopted a resolution providing for an intergovernmental conference to negotiate an ‘international legally binding instrument’, under UNCLOS, on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction. The first session of the Preparatory Commission took place in April 2016.

¹⁴ The text is at http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/69/780 (last accessed 3 July 2015). The recommendations of the Working Group also envisage the establishment of a preparatory committee, to begin work in 2016 and to report to the UNGA in 2017 with recommendations on the elements of a text..

6. Future collaboration

As discussed above, the 2013 analysis by IUCN suggested that the omission of ABNJ from the ambit of the World Heritage Convention has resulted in significant gaps in the coverage of the Convention.¹⁵

The study also highlighted the work of other organizations which are already working in ABNJ and it felt that there was an important opportunity for the World Heritage Convention to establish linkages and complementarities with the work of others. The Study suggested that ‘further exploration ... could be turned to how the Convention might interface with other international instruments and institutions.’

One example is the Convention on the Conservation of Biological Diversity (CBD). The CBD Secretariat has convened a series of workshops over the past five years in collaboration with regional marine organizations to identify and describe ‘Ecologically or Biologically Significant Areas’ (EBSAs) in the marine realm, particularly in ABNJ.¹⁶ The application of the concepts and criteria the World Heritage Convention applies to identify areas of OUV – concepts that have matured for over 40 years and produced ample conservation successes and best practices – could prove particularly valuable in the work toward the protection of EBSAs in areas beyond national jurisdiction. Also, many other bodies would be ideal collaborators in the development of protection and management regimes for such sites.¹⁷

“The concepts and criteria of the World Heritage Convention have matured for over 40 years and produced ample conservation successes and best practices”

¹⁵ *Marine Natural Heritage and the World Heritage List interpretation of World Heritage criteria in marine systems, analysis of biogeographic representation of sites, and a roadmap for addressing gaps*, IUCN 2013.

¹⁶ For further details see the map and explanations at <https://www.cbd.int/ebsa/>

¹⁷ See footnote 7 above.

PART II
Potential Outstanding
Universal Value in the
High Seas

2



An unidentified larval deep-sea angler fish.
© Sönke Johnsen

1. Introduction



Hydrothermal vents in the Lau Basin.
Photo courtesy of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute and Charles Fisher, Pennsylvania State University.

This publication takes a systematic approach to illustrating how the concept of OUV could be applied in ABNJ. The approach used is mindful that the purpose of this publication is not to propose a possible tentative list of potential sites, but rather simply to demonstrate through a small selected number of illustrations the need for, and the urgency of, the identification and protection of World Heritage sites in the High Seas. The selected illustrations reflect a sample of the unique variety of ecosystem types, natural marine phenomena and biodiversity that exist in the High Seas and would merit World Heritage recognition. While the research for potential areas of OUV in the High Seas has focused on natural marine features and ecosystems, nothing would prevent the identification of cultural sites in the High Seas at a later stage.

The selection process to illustrate the potential for OUV for this publication has been rigorous and multifaceted. A

preliminary desktop assessment of potential areas to illustrate possible OUV in the High Seas was undertaken. The results formed the basis for a more inclusive discussion during a two-day technical working meeting with High Seas experts from around the world. The agenda and list of participants of the meeting are included in Annex II. The conclusions of the meeting have been integrated in this publication.

It is important to underline that still only a small portion of this vast majestic space, the High Seas, is known to the current generation of experts. The large majority of features and phenomena in the High Seas is yet to be discovered and named by science. This reality further underlines that the selection of illustrations presented in this publication is no more than a first reflection and many other High Seas features might be considered of potential OUV in the future.

2. Outstanding Universal Value: the concept that underpins World Heritage¹⁸

Central to the World Heritage Convention is the concept of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). OUV defines why a place is considered so significant as to justify recognition and inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List. OUV is what underpins the whole of the World Heritage Convention. Nomination of a site for consideration of its listing as World Heritage is decided by a determination of its OUV. The ultimate decision over whether or not a site is of OUV lies with the World Heritage Committee that meets annually.¹⁹

Firstly, this implies that the features of the proposed site are outstanding globally, and to do this effectively requires a global comparative analysis, assessing the features of the site against other sites on a global basis. Secondly, a screening of existing properties on the World Heritage List must be undertaken, to ensure that the site in question is not already addressed by a better example being included on the List, and includes features that are lacking from the existing portfolio of World Heritage sites. Both of these processes require significant investment in conducting the appropriate level of data collection – *in situ* and from the literature – both on the site in question, and its comparison against sites around the world.

The selection of illustrative sites of possible OUV in the High Seas involved the following approach:

Outstanding: the approach has not been to select numerous examples of locations with similar processes and ecosystems, but rather to review existing literature and select unique examples across ocean basins to showcase the different types of ecosystems, natural phenomena and biodiversity of possible OUV that exists in ABNJ. Thus, the illustrative list included in this publication showcases some of the very best examples of possible OUV in the High Seas, selected on the basis of existing scientific work. The intent has been to develop illustrations of potential OUV in the High Seas to demonstrate within a minimum number of locations how the different World Heritage criteria could be met in the High Seas.

Universal: the approach has been to view marine ABNJ as a whole for this exercise, in order to consider sites of the most widespread concern for all of humanity. Thus, while identification of potential OUV has had regard for geographical distribution of examples cited in this publication, the approach has been to select a range of the most compelling examples known globally of differing aspects of potential OUV for marine ABNJ as a whole, thus fulfilling this important aspect of the Convention.

Outstanding Universal Value (OUV)

Outstanding – the site should be *exceptional*. The *World Heritage Convention* sets out to define the geography of the superlative – the most outstanding natural and cultural places on Earth.

Universal - The scope of the Convention is *global* in relation to the significance of the properties to be protected as well as its importance to all people of the world. Sites cannot be considered for OUV from only a national or regional perspective.

Value – implies clearly defining the *worth* of a property, ranking its importance based on clear and consistent standards, including the recognition and assessment of its integrity.

¹⁸ Information about OUV and World Heritage criteria is available at : <http://whc.unesco.org/criteria/>

¹⁹ Information about the World Heritage Committee is available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/committee/>



Small polychaete worms roaming over the tentacles of an anemone.
Image courtesy of the NOAA Office of Ocean Exploration and Research, 2015 Hohonu Moana.

Value: two processes were run in tandem to ensure that only a selection of the most important locations are included as illustrations. The process drew on analyses of existing information of ecosystems, biodiversity and marine phenomena in marine ABNJ. The information is largely based on the EBSA processes and conclusions developed under the CBD but also draw on experience from other approaches such as OSPAR²⁰ and specific regional sea surveys such as those for seamounts. Such exercises have already identified, based on current knowledge and the experience of countless scientists, and through rigorous processes, lists of important areas in the world ocean. So there was, through this element of the approach, a solid scientific foundation to immediately draw from – with the

CBD process being the largest and most comprehensive with full documentation publicly available. Alongside this, the study also accessed the knowledge of a number of highly experienced advisors and scientists specialized in the field of High Seas ecosystems and biodiversity to identify their top locations in marine ABNJ. This information was then assimilated into the illustrative list of sites included here and finalized through an iterative process with the leading scientists concerned. An additional important determinant alongside this was to ensure adequate scientific documentation was available to allow for an adequate description of the possible OUV of the respective illustrations. A central consideration that needs to be taken into account when reflecting on areas of possible OUV in the High Seas is the fact that a large majority of species and phenomena are yet to be discovered by science.

²⁰ OSPAR is the mechanism by which 15 Governments and the European Union cooperate to protect the marine environment of the North-East Atlantic.

3. The criteria that determine Outstanding Universal Value

Nominating a site for inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List requires a rigorous process of identifying the features of potential OUV at a site, and making a case for inscription. The concept of OUV itself is based on three foundations:

- 1) A property is required to meet one or more of the World Heritage criteria;
- 2) A property is required to meet the conditions of integrity (and authenticity if relevant);
- 3) Property needs to meet the requirements for protection and management.

All three aspects must be in place for a property to be recognized as of OUV and as such become eligible for inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List.

World Heritage criteria: Of the ten World Heritage criteria, only four relate to natural World Heritage. As set out in the introduction, only natural phenomena in the High Seas have been considered for the purpose of this publication. The Table below lists the four natural World Heritage criteria.

Since the primary documents for World Heritage listing do not make detailed reference to physical marine or ocean processes, IUCN has developed guidance for marine systems (Obura et al., 2012; Abdulla et al., 2013). Criterion viii refers to earth history, geological processes, landforms, geomorphic and physiographic features, clearly targeting physical and geological features of the planet, in contrast to the biological features of criteria ix and x. Physical oceanographic features may be most directly related to these terms, so criterion viii has been identified as the most appropriate one for physical




An Unidentified Swimming Organism.
Image courtesy of the NOAA Office of Ocean Exploration and Research, 2015 Hohonu Moana.

ocean processes, including water masses, currents, waves, coastal and land-sea interaction processes, and polar ice.

Application of criteria vii, ix and x in marine systems can be considered to be consistent with their application on land. Criterion vii is generally considered only where sites already meet at least one of criteria viii, ix or x. Criterion ix explicitly mentions 'coastal' and 'marine' and biological oceanographic processes, and habitat and ecosystem dynamics can be treated equivalently in the sea as on land. Criterion x, focusing on species and critical habitats for their conservation, can similarly be applied in the same way both in the sea and on land.

Inscription criteria			
vii. Contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance;	viii. Be outstanding examples representing major stages of Earth's history , including the record of life, significant ongoing geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features;	ix. Be outstanding examples representing significant ongoing ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals;	x. Contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in situ conservation of biological diversity , including those containing threatened species of OUV from the point of view of science or conservation.

The 3 pillars of the concept of Outstanding Universal Value



© UNESCO


Integrity: It is not enough for a site to meet the World Heritage criteria only. A site must also meet the conditions of 'integrity' and/or 'authenticity' (the latter for cultural sites) and must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding. The condition of integrity is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the heritage of the site and its attributes that are established when an adequate and long-term protection and management system is in place to ensure its safeguarding. Thus, the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity are an integral element when considering the concept and application of OUV and without both having been met a site should not be listed. This question is even more important when looking at sites that straddle different jurisdictions, or extend to ABNJ.

Protection and management: Recognition of OUV and inscription is only part of World Heritage. The other part is the assurance that the characteristics for which a site is recognized as World Heritage will be maintained. Properties that are of comparable importance in terms of their value but in poor condition, or without effective protection and management, may be regarded as having a weaker claim or potential OUV compared with a property in good condition and with a high standard of protection and management. Obviously, this consideration is of particular concern for the sites of potential OUV in the High Seas considering the lack of an overall protection mechanism currently in place. While unified mechanisms and actions are being considered by the United Nations under UNCLOS, 'competent authorities' do also already exist to some extent in ABNJ. These sectoral bodies often have explicit requirements to have due regard for the environment in executing their functions and so provide a starting point to ensure any OUV recognized in the future can be secured.

Reporting and Monitoring: Inscribing a site on the World Heritage List is the beginning of a permanent relationship with the Convention. Site managers and local and national authorities continuously work towards managing, monitoring and preserving the World Heritage properties. States Parties have an obligation to regularly prepare reports about the state of conservation and the various protection measures put in place at their sites. These reports allow the World Heritage Committee to assess the conditions at the sites and, eventually, to decide on the necessity of adopting specific measures to resolve recurrent problems. One such measure is the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In situations where the site deteriorates to a point where the OUV is lost, the World Heritage Committee may decide to remove it from the World Heritage List. These actions under the Convention are set out in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, particularly under paragraphs 178 – 198 but especially 192 onwards.²¹

²¹ *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, UNESCO, WHC.15/01, 8 July 2015. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>

4. Illustrations of potential Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas




1. The Lost City Hydrothermal Field 2. The Costa Rica Thermal Dome 3. The White Shark Café
4. The Sargasso Sea 5. The Atlantis Bank

Illustrations of potential Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas.
© UNESCO

Based on the considerations detailed in the previous sections, this chapter brings together a first snapshot of areas and natural features of potential OUV in the deep ocean. While a systematic approach has been taken toward identifying this collection of sites, it is by no means a comprehensive tentative list of potential OUV in the High Seas. Many other unique features in the High Seas would likely also merit

World Heritage recognition while overall still very little of the deep ocean is actually known to science. The sites identified in the next sections are thus but a sample of the truly iconic treasures our deep oceans harbour and are meant to inspire their possible future protection as part of our global heritage legacy of humankind.



Antipatharian black coral (possibly *Leiopathes* sp.), host to a wide variety of invertebrates.
© Sönke Johnsen


Ocean	Name	Main features that could make up the sites' potential Outstanding Universal Value
PACIFIC OCEAN	The Costa Rica Thermal Dome	The Costa Rica Thermal Dome is a unique oceanic oasis, a wind-driven upwelling system, which forms a highly productive area and a critical habitat, which provides singular spawning sites, migration pathways and feeding grounds to multiple endangered and commercially important species.
	The White Shark Café	The White Shark Café is a pristine open ocean region approximately halfway between the North American mainland and Hawaii that is the site for the only known offshore aggregation of north Pacific white sharks. The Café provides a unique offshore habitat where these irreplaceable marine predators congregate in cobalt blue pristine waters.
ATLANTIC OCEAN	The Sargasso Sea	The 'Golden Floating Rainforest of the Ocean', the Sargasso Sea, is home to an iconic pelagic ecosystem built around the floating <i>Sargassum</i> seaweeds, the world's only holopelagic algae. It was first viewed by Columbus on his first voyage in 1492 and has been a place of myth and legend ever since. Its global importance derives from a combination of physical and oceanographic structures, its complex pelagic ecosystems, and its role in global ocean and earth system processes.
	The Lost City Hydrothermal Field	The Lost City Hydrothermal Field is a remarkable geobiological feature (biotope) in the deep sea (700-800 metre water depth) that is unlike any other ecosystem yet known on Earth. The site, dominated by the <i>Poseidon</i> carbonate monolith (a 60-metre high carbonate edifice), was discovered serendipitously in 2000 during an <i>Alvin</i> dive on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, and it is still being explored.
INDIAN OCEAN	The Atlantis Bank	The Atlantis Bank, located within sub-tropical waters of the Indian Ocean, was the first tectonic sunken fossil island ever studied. The complex geomorphology of old headlands, precipitous cliffs, stacks, beaches and lagoons harbours a very diverse deep-sea fauna at depths from 700 to 4,000 metre characterized by large anemones, large armchair-sized sponges, and octocorals. Large <i>Paragorgia</i> colonies are particularly notable.

The following sections provide a brief synopsis of the potential justification of World Heritage criteria for each of the respective sites. More elaborate descriptions are available in the appendices of this publication (available online at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/marine-programme/>).

The Lost City Hydrothermal Field

1. Introduction

The Lost City Hydrothermal Field was discovered in 2000 and is unlike any other ecosystem yet known on Earth. It is a remarkable feature in the deep sea (700-800 metre water depth), formed by a combination of geological and biological forces. It is an area of active hot spring venting where serpentinite cliffs ‘weep’ hot fluids, producing delicate finger-like outgrowths and multi-pinnacle chimneys, which has been ongoing for 120,000 years. The site is dominated by the Poseidon carbonate monolith, a 60-metre tall edifice made of carbonate, the raw material of chalk and limestone. Endemic invertebrate species are likely to exhibit unusual biochemical and physiological adaptations that have not yet been described in nature. The Lost City has been suggested as presenting an example of the chemical precursors for the origin of life, attracting the interest of the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) as a means of identifying the chemical signatures of life on other planets and moons.



The Lost City Hydrothermal Field. Data: Bathymetry (Karson et al., 2015) and hydrothermal vents (Kelley et al., 2007).
© UNESCO / Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab, Duke University

2. Threats

The main threat is from indirect impact from deep-sea mining for minerals. The rugged seabed topography in the region is such that fishing is unlikely to be an issue.

3. Potential Outstanding Universal Value

3.1. Potential justification of World Heritage Criteria

CRITERION VII – SUPERLATIVE NATURAL PHENOMENA OR NATURAL BEAUTY AND AESTHETIC IMPORTANCE

The Lost City Hydrothermal Field is globally singular among all known hydrothermal sites in the eerily lovely sculpture of its carbonate precipitates, their size and longevity (120,000 years).

CRITERION VIII – MAJOR STAGES IN EARTH’S HISTORY AND GEOLOGICAL PROCESSES

The Lost City Hydrothermal Field presents a unique example of fluid chemistry, of lower-temperature (<150 °C) weathering of ultramafic (upper mantle) rock (peridotite) exposed to seawater into serpentinite (a process called ‘serpentinization’), and associated microbial and invertebrate communities. Discoveries made at this site have fundamentally expanded our understanding of the diversity of hydrothermal processes on Earth and potentially in extra-terrestrial oceans.

CRITERION IX – SIGNIFICANT ECOLOGICAL AND BIOLOGICAL PROCESSES IN THE EVOLUTION OF ECOSYSTEMS, COMMUNITIES OF PLANT AND ANIMALS

The Lost City Hydrothermal Field is postulated as a contemporary analogue for conditions where life on early Earth may have originated and for conditions that might support life within oceans of extra-terrestrial planetary bodies.

CRITERION X – SIGNIFICANT BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND THREATENED SPECIES OF OUV

Many of the taxa of the Lost City Hydrothermal Field – microbial and invertebrate – are so far known only from this site and represent ‘living libraries’, with biochemical and physiological adaptations to their extreme environment yet to be understood.

3.2. Geographic scale and site integrity

The Lost City Hydrothermal Field extends for at least 400 metres across the terrace on top of the Atlantis Massif in the northeast Atlantic. A 20-km wide buffer zone around the Lost City Hydrothermal Field would safeguard the integrity of this site.


3.3. Protection and management

No management system is currently in place for this site. The site would qualify as a Vulnerable Marine Ecosystem (VME) under the criteria of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and be subject to management by a Regional Marine Fisheries Organization (RMFO).



Photomosaic of a 13 m-tall carbonate chimney called Ryan. Long term seepage of fluids from steep cliffs bounding the eastern side of the Lost City Hydrothermal Field has resulted in beautiful arrays of narrow pinnacles that reach many tens of meters in height.

© D.S. Kelley and M. Elend, School of Oceanography, University of Washington.



The three-story-tall actively venting carbonate tower called IMAX protrudes from the north face of a much larger edifice called Poseidon in the Lost City Hydrothermal Field. Poseidon rises ~60 m above the surrounding seafloor. The area has been active for >120,000 years.

© D.S. Kelley and M. Elend, School of Oceanography, University of Washington.



Space shot to our own planet: ROV Hercules approaches a ghostly, white, carbonate spire in the Lost City Hydrothermal Field, about 760 metre below the surface of the Atlantic Ocean.

Image courtesy of IFE, URI-IAO, UW, Lost City science party, and NOAA.




Deep-sea jelly fish, possibly *Poralia rufescens*, undulating several meters above the seafloor just south of the IMAX vent at Lost City.

Image courtesy of IFE, URI-IAO, Lost City science party, and NOAA

The Costa Rica Thermal Dome

1. Introduction

The Costa Rica Thermal Dome is an oceanic oasis of high productivity in the Eastern Tropical Pacific, created through an interaction between wind and currents and covers a 300-500 km wide area. Although mobile, as most oceanographic features are, its location and presence off the coast of Costa Rica and Central America are reliable and predictable. Its high primary productivity attracts large ocean-going fish, marine mammals and marine mega-predators such as sharks, tuna, dolphins and whales. It is part of a migration corridor for critically endangered leatherback turtles. The high productivity of the Costa Rica Thermal Dome provides an outstanding year-round feeding and breeding habitat for the endangered blue whale, as well as critical habitats for other emblematic marine vertebrates, such as turtles and dolphins.



The Costa Rica Thermal Dome. Data: Bathymetry (GEBCO 2014) and surface currents (Lumpkin and Johnson 2013).
© UNESCO / Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab, Duke University

2. Threats

The Costa Rica Thermal Dome is exposed to threats and pressures from a variety of anthropogenic impacts, especially shipping traffic, overfishing, illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (IUU), pollution from marine and land-based sources (agriculture, wastewater) and climate change.

3. Potential Outstanding Universal Value

3.1. Potential justification of World Heritage Criteria

CRITERION VIII – MAJOR STATES IN EARTH'S HISTORY AND GEOLOGICAL PROCESSES

The Costa Rica Thermal Dome was first observed in 1948, recreated seasonally through an interaction between coastal wind and currents. It is defined by a globally unique shoaling of the generally strong, shallow thermocline with upwelling of cool, nutrient-rich water, which promotes blooms of surface plankton that nurture a globally exceptional environment for highly migratory marine predators. The upwelling at the Dome persists throughout the summer and early autumn and diminishes through December-January.

CRITERION IX – SIGNIFICANT ECOLOGICAL AND BIOLOGICAL PROCESSES IN THE EVOLUTION OF ECOSYSTEMS, COMMUNITIES OF PLANT AND ANIMALS

The upwelling of deep, nutrient-rich water at the Costa Rica Thermal Dome is an incredible ecological process that results in an area of high primary production which is heavily used by highly migratory marine predators such as tuna, billfish, sharks, manta rays, dolphins and whales, in particular endangered blue whales. The unique ecological process forms part of the migratory corridor of a population of endangered leatherback turtles nesting in Costa Rica, and all life stages of blue whale can be found here.

CRITERION X – SIGNIFICANT BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND THREATENED SPECIES OF OUV

The blue whale is classified as an endangered species on the IUCN Red List, but is likely to meet the criterion for Critically Endangered. The Eastern North Pacific blue whale population, at approximately 3,000 individuals, is the largest in the world, and the Costa Rica Thermal Dome provides critical habitat for feeding, mating, breeding, calving and raising calves. Surrounded by oligotrophic ocean, the high productivity of the area provides habitat for abundant communities of phytoplankton and zooplankton, which in turn provide a source of food for squid, commercially important tunas and cetaceans. It contains critical habitats for other IUCN Red List species such as the leatherback turtle.

3.2. Geographic scale and site integrity

The proposed boundary encapsulates the thermal dome, which has a distinct biological habitat 300–500 km across and provides the basis for securing its integrity.

3.3. Protection and management

The Costa Rica Thermal Dome was nominated as an Ecologically or Biologically Significant Area (EBSA) in 2009. There is currently no management system in place that could adequately protect the site's unique characteristics.



Balaenoptera musculus (blue whale).
© Public Domain - NOAA Photo Library



Manta ray.
© Kristina Vackova/Shutterstock.com



Yellow fin tuna fast moving in the ocean.
© Tom Wang/Shutterstock.com




Leatherback sea turtle crawling up the beach to complete the nesting process.
© Stephanie Rousseau/Shutterstock.com

The White Shark Café

1. Introduction

Approximately halfway between North America and Hawaii, in the vastness of the eastern Pacific, there is a place that to a human observer looks featureless and unremarkable. It is however of globally unique importance to one of the ocean's largest hunters, the great white shark, which migrate far offshore, congregating in this remote spot, probably to feed and mate. Researchers call it the White Shark Café. The tagging data indicates that this is a seasonal aggregation site for the majority of the adult white shark population in the north-eastern Pacific. No other place like it is known anywhere else in the world. Electronic tagging data have shown that in addition to white sharks, other pelagic shark species including mako, salmon, blue sharks, and tunas (albacore, bigeye and yellowfin tunas) also migrate to this distinct and enigmatic region of the subtropical gyre.



The White Shark Café. Data: Bathymetry (GEBCO 2014) and surface currents (Lumpkin and Johnson 2013).
© UNESCO / Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab, Duke University

2. Threats

The main threat is fishing and in particular the international longline fleet that covers the international waters that include the White Shark Café.

3. Potential Outstanding Universal Value

3.1. Potential justification of World Heritage Criteria

CRITERION VII – SUPERLATIVE NATURAL PHENOMENA OR NATURAL BEAUTY AND AESTHETIC IMPORTANCE

Pelagic environments support important species aggregations, and coastal species often utilize offshore habitat during some phase of their life cycle. Photo identification of white shark individuals and acoustic and satellite tagging has shown that white sharks occupy this predictable aggregation site in the waters off North America, most likely determined by the sub-tropical gyre and the currents circulating around it.

CRITERION IX – SIGNIFICANT ECOLOGICAL AND BIOLOGICAL PROCESSES IN THE EVOLUTION OF ECOSYSTEMS, COMMUNITIES OF PLANT AND ANIMALS

Genetic studies demonstrate that global white shark populations have a discrete subpopulation structure with unique demographics in South Africa, Australia, the North-East Pacific Ocean, the North-West Atlantic and the Mediterranean Sea. Electronic tagging has shown that North-East Pacific Ocean sub-adult and adult white sharks seasonally inhabit warmer offshore waters of the subtropical gyre (the White Shark Café), and return to the California Current to coastal foraging zones.

CRITERION X – SIGNIFICANT BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND THREATENED SPECIES OF OUV

White sharks are protected internationally under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES - Appendix II) and listed as Vulnerable under the IUCN Red List. In the North-East Pacific Ocean, the unique population of white sharks are of significant conservation concern.

3.2. Geographic scale and site integrity


The White Shark Café consists of a large and well-delineated oligotrophic area in the centre of the sub-tropical gyre, centred between the Baja peninsula and the big island of Hawaii. The area thus acts as a functional unit and accordingly displays high site integrity.

3.3. Protection and management

The Café has been identified as a candidate Ecologically or Biologically Significant Area (EBSA). There is currently no adequate protection in place for this site.




Great white shark at Isla Guadalupe, Mexico, August 2006.
Animal estimated at 11-12 feet (3.3 to 3.6 m) in length, age unknown.
© Pterantula (Terry Goss) via Wikimedia Commons



Site fidelity of satellite tagged white sharks from the central coast of California ($n = 68$) to three core areas in the north-eastern Pacific including the North American continental shelf waters, the waters surrounding the Hawaiian Island Archipelago and the white shark 'Café'. Yellow circles represent position estimates from light- and SST-based geolocations (Teo et al., 2004), and red circles indicate satellite tag endpoint positions (Argos transmissions), respectively.

Source: Jorgensen et al., 2010




Great white shark posing in the deep blue water.
© Stefan Pircher/Shutterstock.com

The Sargasso Sea

1. Introduction

The 'Golden Floating Rainforest of the Ocean', the Sargasso Sea, is home to an iconic pelagic ecosystem built around the floating *Sargassum* seaweed, the world's only holopelagic algae.²² Located within the North Atlantic sub-tropical gyre, it is the only sea without coasts, for only the islands of Bermuda lie within it. The floating *Sargassum* hosts a diverse community of associated organisms that include ten endemic species and it is the only breeding location for European and American eels.



The Sargasso Sea. Data: Bathymetry (GEBCO 2014) and surface currents (Lumpkin and Johnson 2013).
© UNESCO / Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab, Duke University

2. Threats

Despite its remote location, the Sargasso Sea faces anthropogenic threats. Fisheries' impacts and floating plastic impact the naturalness of the area as does shipping traffic and vessel discharges, as well as climate change.

3. Potential Outstanding Universal Value

3.1. Potential justification of World Heritage Criteria

CRITERION VII – SUPERLATIVE NATURAL PHENOMENA OR NATURAL BEAUTY AND AESTHETIC IMPORTANCE

The Sargasso Sea is the only one of the world's five ocean gyres with a significant floating community based around *Sargassum* algae and a variety of oceanographic features and processes that influences the ecology and biology on a variety of spatial and temporal scales. The site is a globally outstanding natural phenomena and its floating golden *Sargassum* of exceptional aesthetic value.

CRITERION IX – SIGNIFICANT ECOLOGICAL AND BIOLOGICAL PROCESSES IN THE EVOLUTION OF ECOSYSTEMS, COMMUNITIES OF PLANT AND ANIMALS

The two species of floating *Sargassum* found in the Sargasso Sea are the world's only holopelagic macroalgae, and the Sea is home to numerous endemic species that are, by definition, rare.

CRITERION X – SIGNIFICANT BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND THREATENED SPECIES OF OUV

Many of the species utilizing the Sargasso Sea are of global conservation significance, appearing on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, and/or under CITES, as well as in the annexes of the 1990 Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife Protocol (SPA) of the Cartagena Convention.

3.2. Geographical scale and site integrity

The Sargasso Sea represents an entire ocean gyre system, surrounded by the Gulf Stream to the west, the North Atlantic Drift to the north, the more diffuse Canary Current to the east, and the North Equatorial Current and the Antilles Current to the south. The area acts as a functional unit and accordingly displays high site integrity.

3.3. Protection and management

In March 2014, representatives from five governments signed the Hamilton Declaration on Collaboration for the Conservation of the Sargasso Sea.²³ Pursuant to the Declaration, Bermuda established the Sargasso Sea Commission to exercise a stewardship role and to assist the signatory governments in developing proposals for conservation measures.

²² Holopelagic algae are distinct from all other complex seaweeds in not having an attached benthic stage.

²³ For more information: http://www.sargassoseacommission.org/storage/documents/Hamilton_Declaration_on_Collaboration_for_the_Conservation_of_the_Sargasso_Sea.with_signatures.pdf. (Accessed 21/04/2016)



Loggerhead turtle hatchlings surrounded by *Sargassum* weed.
© Masa Ushioda imagequestmarine.com




Humpback whale in the Sargasso Sea.
© Andrew Stevenson

The Atlantis Bank

1. Introduction

The Atlantis Bank is a sunken tectonic fossil island, harbouring an extraordinary diverse deep-sea fauna. Located on the Southwest Indian Ridge, it has a unique paleontological record and was pivotal to understanding the geology of 'ultraslow' spreading seabed ridges. It is often considered a tectonic window providing one of the best places in the world for scientific study of Earth's geology. It is also of global value as it is a 'cold' or tectonic bank (rather than of more common volcanic origin – hence a bank and not a seamount), consisting of a sunken fossil island (guyot) of crustal origin. It was named after the mythical island of Atlantis because of its remarkable preservation of ancient island features. It has two fossil beaches, lagoons and a submerged headland. About two-thirds of the bank is covered with ripple marks identical to those in the sand on exposed beaches. These were 'frozen' or lithified as rock millions of years ago, as the island sank.



The Atlantis Bank. Data: Bathymetry (GEBCO 2014, Dick 1986) and seamounts (Yesson et al. 2011).
© UNESCO / Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab, Duke University

2. Threats

The complex topography of the Atlantis Seamount has protected it from past bottom-trawling activities, and thus is particularly important in preserving diverse seabed communities on the Southwest Indian Ridge in sub-tropical waters.

3. Potential Outstanding Universal Value

3.1. Potential justification of World Heritage Criteria

CRITERION VIII – MAJOR STAGES IN EARTH'S HISTORY AND GEOLOGICAL PROCESSES

The Atlantis Bank is a uniquely remarkable, tectonic feature created by uplift at the Southwest Indian Ridge and subsequent subsidence. While other examples may occur elsewhere, the Atlantis Bank is the most documented and studied example of this type of 'cold' or tectonically-formed feature.

CRITERION IX – SIGNIFICANT ECOLOGICAL AND BIOLOGICAL PROCESSES IN THE EVOLUTION OF ECOSYSTEMS, COMMUNITIES OF PLANT AND ANIMALS

The Atlantis Bank harbours an outstanding deep-sea fauna consisting of highly diverse and stunning coral gardens and complex sea-cliff deep-sea communities characterized by large anemones, armchair-sized sponges, glass sponges, octocorals, anemones and predatory sea spiders. Sharks and solitary corals at the summit include unknown species that are yet to be named by science.

CRITERION X – SIGNIFICANT BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND THREATENED SPECIES OF OUV

The Bank is a true hotspot for biodiversity with a diversity of species of which some at the summit of the site include unknown species. The site is also of unique significance because of its high proportion of sensitive habitats, biotopes and species that are functionally fragile or with slow recovery.

3.2. Geographic scale and site integrity

The Atlantis Bank is a significant feature – rising up from over 5,000 metre deep, it has a top at 700 metre and comprises a complete system and rich diversity of habitats, ecosystems and species.

3.3. Protection and management

It is proposed as an Ecologically or Biologically Significant Area (EBSA) and has been declared a Benthic Protection Area (BPA) by the Southern Indian Ocean Deepwater Fishers Association (SIODFA).



Paragorgia, ~700m depth, Atlantis Seamount.

© The Natural Environment Research Council and IUCN/GEF Seamounts Project C/O Alex D Rogers.



Diverse coral gardens and complex sea-cliff deep-sea communities characterized by large anemones, large sponges and octocorals at the Atlantis Bank, South West Indian Ocean.

© The Natural Environment Research Council and IUCN/GEF Seamounts Project C/O Alex D Rogers.



Rock outcrops, particularly along the edges of the summit host large stylasterid colonies, with the echinoid *Dermochinus horridus*, at the Atlantis Bank, South West Indian Ocean.

© The Natural Environment Research Council and IUCN/GEF Seamounts Project C/O Alex D Rogers.

PART III
Recognizing and
protecting Outstanding
Universal Value in the
High Seas: how could it
work in practice?

3



Signature of the World Heritage Convention by René Maheu,
UNESCO Director-General, 23/11/1972.
© UNESCO / DG

1. Introduction



Deep-sea creature.
© Super Joseph/Shutterstock.com

Part I of this publication examined the context for the preparation of this work and the recommendation of the UNESCO External auditor in 2011 that States Parties to the World Heritage Convention should 'reflect on the appropriate means to preserve sites that correspond to conditions of OUV which are not dependent upon the sovereignty of States Parties.'

Part II has looked in detail at the concept of OUV and identified a number of sites that illustrate the fact that there are likely to be a number of sites with potential OUV in ABNJ. It is not, nor is it intended to be, a comprehensive list. Those sites are merely illustrations and just a primer of how unique and truly exceptional some areas in ABNJ are.

This Part explores the mechanisms by which the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage potentially could allow the inscription and protection of sites in ABNJ on the UNESCO World Heritage List. It does not recommend one preferred approach but does seek to explore briefly the arguments for and against each of a number of possible scenarios, recognizing that not all may be equally practicable. To appreciate the issues involved, it may be useful to first examine in detail the regime created by the Convention.

2. The World Heritage Convention text: an inclusive vision



Saving Abu Simbel.
© UNESCO



Abu Simbel.
© aurelien59/Shutterstock.com

The final text of the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage was adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its 17th Session in Paris, 16 November 1972.²⁴ It entered into force on 17 December 1975. As of March 2016 it has 191 Parties and is thus nearly universally ratified.²⁵

Under the Convention, formal decision making is delegated to the World Heritage Committee -- a rotating committee of 21 States Parties that meets once every year. The Members are elected for four-year terms by all the Parties to the

Convention.²⁶ The Committee is supported by the Secretariat of the Convention, the World Heritage Centre, which is based at UNESCO's headquarters in Paris.²⁷

In addition to establishing rules of procedure, the Committee has also developed Operational Guidelines to help regularize its practice and to assist States Parties that wish to make nominations to understand what will be required of them.²⁸ It is important to note that these guidelines are statutory

²⁴ (1972) 11 *International Legal Materials* 1358.

²⁵ Cf. As of March 2016, the 1992 UN Framework Convention on Climate Change had 197 parties and the 1992 Convention on Conservation of Biological Diversity had 196 parties. The UN had 193 Member States.

²⁶ Article 9.1 of the Convention foresees a six-year term for Committee Members, but there has been a voluntary reduction of members of the Committee of the term from 6 to 4 (see 13 GA9 and practice).

²⁷ More information about the World Heritage Centre and the advisory bodies to the World Heritage Convention is available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/world-heritage-centre/> and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/advisorybodies/>

²⁸ *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural And Natural Heritage, UNESCO, WHC.15/01, 8 July 2015


administrative provisions that are designed to facilitate the implementation of the Convention. Paragraph 1.A of the Operational Guidelines makes it clear that they set out the procedures for, *inter alia*, the inscription of sites and will be ‘periodically revised to reflect the decisions of the World Heritage Committee.’ To this extent they clearly must not go beyond the text of the Convention itself, but it is always open to the Parties to any Convention to agree among themselves what the text of a Convention means in contemporary practice.

The overarching objectives of the Convention are set out in the Preamble, which for purposes of interpretation constitutes a part of the text of the Convention.²⁹ The unique and uncompromising vision of the original drafters is to prevent the loss of the world’s cultural and natural heritage. After recalling that UNESCO has been mandated by its Constitution to maintain, increase and diffuse knowledge by assuring the conservation and protection of the world’s heritage, it goes on to recognize that ‘parts of the cultural or natural heritage are of outstanding interest and therefore need to be preserved as part of the *world heritage of mankind as a whole*.’ It highlights the fact that existing international instruments ‘demonstrate the importance, for all the peoples of the world, of safeguarding this unique and irreplaceable property, *‘to whatever people it may belong.*’ It stresses the need for a convention ‘establishing an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and in accordance with modern scientific methods.’

Nothing in this inspirational vision suggests that natural or cultural heritage of OUV which is located in marine ABNJ should be excluded from this protection. Indeed, it would be strange if more or less half of the world were to be excluded from what is indicated as ‘world heritage’. As defined by the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the seabed ‘Area’ (as well as its resources) beyond national jurisdiction are the *common heritage of mankind*³⁰ and the water column above this and beyond the 200 nm exclusive economic zones of coastal states is the high seas – waters that are open to all and that may not be subjected to the sovereignty of any state – *the global commons*.³¹

The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties provides that a special meaning shall be given to any term used in a treaty if it is established that the Parties so intended.³² This is particularly relevant to the interpretation of Articles 1 and 2 of the World

Heritage Convention that define natural³³ and cultural³⁴ heritage respectively. Neither term is defined in ways that restricts its application to areas within the national territory of its Parties.



A rare observation of an aplacophoran (shell-less mollusk) feeding on a bamboo coral.
Image courtesy of the NOAA Office of Ocean Exploration and Research, 2015 Hohonu Moana.

“Nothing in this inspirational vision suggests that natural or cultural heritage of OUV which is located in marine ABNJ should be excluded from this protection.”

³³ Article 1: For the purpose of this Convention, the following shall be considered as “cultural heritage”:

- monuments: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;
- groups of buildings: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;
- sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view.

³⁴ Article 2: For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as “natural heritage”:

- natural features consisting of physical and biological formations or groups of such formations, which are of outstanding universal value from the aesthetic or scientific point of view;
- geological and physiographical formations and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation;
- natural sites or precisely delineated natural areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty.

²⁹ Article 31(2), 1969, Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 1155 *United Nations Treaty Series [UNTS]* 331.

³⁰ Art 136, 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, 1833 *UNTS* 396 (UNCLOS).

³¹ Arts 87 and 89, UNCLOS.

³² Art 31(4), Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

3. Provisions for nominating World Heritage sites



Close up of a basket star, with commensal ophiuroids.
Image courtesy of the NOAA Office of Ocean Exploration and Research, 2016 Deepwater Exploration of the Marianas.

Despite the inclusive vision of the World Heritage Convention, however, there are a number of other provisions in the Convention, particularly related to the process of nomination of possible sites that appear to restrict the nomination of sites to those which are 'situated on the territory' of any of its States Parties.

For example, Article 3 provides that 'It is for each State Party to this Convention to identify and delineate the different properties situated on its territory mentioned in Articles 1 and 2 above.' Article 4 provides that 'Each State Party to this Convention recognizes that the duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage referred to in Articles 1 and 2 and situated on its territory, belongs primarily to that State.' Indeed, the very process for inscription of World Heritage sites under Article

11 requires that each State Party initially submit an inventory of property 'situated in its territory and suitable for inclusion in the list.' These properties are then assessed by the World Heritage Committee for their OUV before they are eligible for inscription.

The text of the Convention therefore reflects what was seen by the drafters in the 1970s as the appropriate processes for assessing the overwhelming majority of cultural and natural heritage sites of OUV that are located within national borders. At that time of course, there was no widespread knowledge, or understanding, of the significance of many ecosystems far from land and deep beneath the ocean. For example, hydrothermal vents with extremophile chemical-based life forms were only discovered in the late 1970s. The United Nations Law of the Sea Convention was finalized in 1982, a decade after the World Heritage Convention.

For the interpretation of the Convention text, however, it is important to note that although it lays down these procedures, nowhere does it say that other procedures may not be developed to secure and safeguard sites. For example, Article 11(3) requires simply the consent of the ‘State concerned’ for the inclusion of a property in the World Heritage list. It does not require that it be the State in whose territory the property is situated that makes the nomination.

So although the protection of marine sites in ANBJ may not have been provided with an obvious means of recognition by the original drafters of the Convention, it cannot be said that as a matter of legal interpretation to be beyond the ‘objects and purposes’ of the original design of the Convention. It is well known that treaty regimes evolve over time as does the wider legal context in which they operate. As Francioni has said in his definitive study of the Convention: *‘In the thirty five years that have passed since the adoption of the World Heritage Convention, international law has undergone profound transformation.’* New concepts and principles have emerged which place great emphasis on the idea of ‘international public goods’, common interest of humanity and ‘common concern.’³⁵

He further states that *‘The dynamic character of international law in the areas of natural and cultural heritage ... has facilitated the development of interpretative criteria that permit the adaptation of existing law to new realities and risks.’*³⁶ It is in this context that it is always open to the States Parties to the Convention among themselves to determine the contemporary meaning of the Convention. The Operational Guidelines, discussed above, which are agreed by the World Heritage Committee, could be seen as a way in which an innovative approach to the interpretation of the Convention could be introduced. Although it should be cautioned that such an approach is not likely to be entirely free from controversy (see below).

Of course if the States Parties were to consider exploring how sites in marine ANBJ might be inscribed, then the way in which such a new procedure would work could benefit from wider discussion.




Hoplostethus crassispinus, in the same genus as, and related to the Orange Roughy but lives a somewhat solitary existence.
Image courtesy of the NOAA Office of Ocean Exploration and Research, 2015 Hohonu Moana.

“Hydrothermal vents with extremophile chemical-based life forms were only discovered in the late 1970s. The United Nations Law of the Sea Convention was finalized in 1982”

³⁵ Francioni F. and Lenzerini F., *The 1972 World Heritage Convention: A Commentary* (Oxford University Press, 2008) p. 6

³⁶ *Ibid.*

4. Possible options for applying Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas



Squat lobsters are common associates on deep-sea corals, like this one observed at Guyot Ridge. Image courtesy of the NOAA Office of Ocean Exploration and Research, 2015 Hohonu Moana.

4.1. Introduction

Allowing the World Heritage Convention to cover protection of unique marine areas beyond national jurisdiction does not require any change in the definitions of natural and cultural heritage. They would remain the same. The central question however is: *how could the necessary procedural changes be made that would allow inscription and protection of World Heritage site in areas beyond national jurisdiction?*

The following sections consider a series of possible scenarios that could be feasible. Each briefly explains one scenario and outlines some of the key arguments for and against. It is not the task of this publication to make any recommendation as to which might be the best approach – that would be for the governing bodies and Parties to the Convention to decide.

Of course, the Convention itself does provide for amendment of the text.³⁷ The procedures for this are laid down in the relevant UNESCO rules of procedure.³⁸ However, for a variety of reasons, such an approach is not a viable option.”

³⁷ Article 37(1) provides: ‘This Convention may be revised by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Any such revision shall, however, bind only the States which shall become Parties to the revising convention.’

³⁸ The Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions covered by the terms of Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Constitution. Adopted by the General Conference at its 5th session, and amended at its 7th, 17th, 25th, 32nd and 35th sessions. The revision procedure entails an examination by the Executive Board and by the General Conference (GC). In addition, a ‘special Committee’ (usually a category 2 meeting) consisting of representatives of Member States may be convened. Section 3.3 (Rules of Procedure) provides that the whole text of the revision could be open for revision, although the decision on the extent of the proposed revision would be taken by the Member States (the Executive Board and GC).

4.2. A ‘bold’ interpretation of the 1972 World Heritage Convention

From a procedural point of view the simplest way to broaden the implementation of a Convention is for the Parties to take an expansive or dynamic view of their competences. This is what Francioni has called a ‘bold interpretation.’³⁹

As discussed above, at the practical level the World Heritage Committee could amend the Operational Guidelines so as to add a process for designation of sites in ABNJ. The Operational Guidelines provide the basis for the daily implementation of the Convention and are established by the 21 members of the World Heritage Committee, which is established in the Convention as the principal governing body for the operation of the Convention, including the criteria to be adopted that define OUV. While the guidelines cannot go beyond the Convention – it is for the Parties themselves to decide what the Convention means in a contemporary context.

There are two levels at which these “bold” operational decisions could be taken, incrementally or by a major policy change:

4.2.1. Incremental changes

The Parties to any agreement can incrementally and pragmatically agree to minor changes in the way that they interpret or apply a treaty. In this case pragmatic decisions on interpretation of the Convention can be taken at an operational level.

The World Heritage Committee has already made a number of such decisions that have adapted the criteria over time. A prime example in the marine sphere would be the way the Committee has already inscribed sites which include areas beyond the territorial sea of coastal states.⁴⁰

Another example is the inclusion of ‘cultural landscapes’ within the categories of sites in the Operational Guidelines, which define these as ‘cultural properties’ that represent the ‘combined works of nature and man.’ These are not specifically mentioned in the definitions of Articles 1 and 2 of the Convention, but the Guidelines have interpreted

those definitions by clearly defining ‘Mixed properties’ in paragraph 46 and “Cultural Landscapes” in paragraph 47.

The advantage of such an incremental approach is that changes can be made by the World Heritage Committee by its own decision making processes and if necessary by the amendment of the Guidelines. However a possible disadvantage is that this could be slow. In other words, the World Heritage Committee may feel it needs to take a series of decisions making incremental changes to the Guidelines rather than adopt a wholesale policy change (discussed below). Moreover, there is a risk that extending inscription to sites in marine ABNJ may not be a type of decision that all States would consider as purely “operational” in nature.

4.2.2. A formal policy change

A second approach that can be taken by the Parties to any Agreement is that they can agree to, and formally announce, a change in the way that they intend to interpret and apply a treaty in the future.⁴¹ For example in 2004, to avoid renegotiating their constitutive treaty, the Parties to the 1982 Convention on Future Multilateral Co-operation in the Northeast Atlantic Fisheries approved a ‘London Declaration on the Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention.’ By this Declaration, they agreed to incorporate the post-1992 global agreements and instruments into their own regime, including the precautionary and ecosystem approach and then to regard themselves as bound by them.⁴²

In this case, it is possible that the World Heritage Committee (or the States Parties as a whole) could make a major policy decision amending the Guidelines so as to contemplate the inscription of marine sites in ABNJ, and prescribing the consequential procedural changes that would be made to facilitate this.

The advantage of such an approach would be that the changes could be made by a decision of the World Heritage Committee (or States Parties) and the changes would have immediate effect. The disadvantages could include the following risks: that the negotiation of the exact wording of the text of the proposed changes might be as long and complex as a treaty negotiation, during which time the composition of the World Heritage Committee would be constantly changing; also that other States Parties to the Convention might challenge the power of the World Heritage Committee to take such a major step by itself.

³⁹ Per Francioni Interview September 2015— although these are not his examples.

⁴⁰ The Phoenix Island Protected Area in Kiribati (2010) and the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument (2010) in the US Hawai’ian islands have both been inscribed as WH sites. The outer limits of both sites extend beyond the territorial sea of Kiribati and the US respectively. Under the terms of Article 2(1) of the 1982 UNCLOS – taken to reflect customary international law – “The sovereignty of a coastal State extends, beyond its land territory and internal waters and, in the case of an archipelagic State, its archipelagic waters, to an adjacent belt of sea, described as the territorial sea.” Beyond that zone however, in its exclusive economic zone, a coastal state only has “sovereign rights” over the resources of the seabed and water column (Art 55, UNCLOS). Although of course, as a matter of international law, the coastal State does have jurisdiction over the protection of the marine environment of its EEZ – giving it the ability to protect WH sites.

⁴¹ Indeed, the Vienna Convention even countenances two or more parties to agreement modifying that agreement only *inter se*, as long as it does not adversely affect other parties and is not contrary to the object and purposes of the agreement (Art 41(1)).

⁴² See Freestone, D. 2010. Fisheries, Commissions and Organizations, in *Max Plank Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, Oxford, OUP, p. 5.

4.3. Amendment outside the terms of the 1972 World Heritage Convention

More radical would be an approach similar to that taken by the United Nations to avoid invoking the complex amendment procedures of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).⁴³ In 1990, UNCLOS had still not come into force because of objections from some developed countries to the seabed mining regime in Part XI of UNCLOS. The United Nations Secretary-General in July 1990 started a series of informal consultations that ultimately resulted in the negotiation of a new text of Part XI. That new text became the 1994 Implementation Agreement. It was presented to the UNGA and approved by Resolution.⁴⁴ The Agreement was then opened for signature and ratification the next day. States that became party to UNCLOS after that date were deemed to have agreed to the 1994 Implementing Agreement also.⁴⁵

In this context it might be open to some or all of the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to agree among themselves to change – or ‘to modify’ in the wording of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties – the regime of the 1972 Convention so as to contemplate the inscription of marine sites in ABNJ, and to prescribe the consequential procedural changes that would be made to facilitate this. This would effectively be a new treaty regime parallel to the 1972 Convention.

This may be a more theoretical approach, but the advantage of this approach is that it would avoid the formal amendment procedures of the 1972 Convention, but would require a very high level of consensus and political will among a substantial number of the States Parties to achieve the desired end, without a long and potentially divisive negotiation. Moreover, the modification would only be effective between the states that had agreed to it, causing some potential implementation complexities.

4.4. An optional protocol to the 1972 World Heritage Convention

Another approach would be the negotiation of an optional protocol to the 1972 Convention relating to the inscription of sites in marine ABNJ. The 1972 Convention does not specifically contemplate the conclusion of a protocol,

but neither does it say it cannot be done.⁴⁶ The UNESCO procedures for new instruments, outlined above, would require that a proposal for such a protocol would include a preliminary study of the technical and legal aspects of the problem under consideration, and examination of this by the UNESCO Executive Board.

The negotiation of a protocol would involve an international negotiation, to which all the States Parties would need to be invited. However, because it would not be an amendment to the Convention, but an addition in order to reflect and implement the full scope of its preamble, it has the advantage that it need not involve all States Parties to the 1972 Convention that are not interested in such a development. As a protocol to the 1972 Convention, it would only be open for signature to States Parties to the 1972 Convention and would be a parallel text which expands the ambit of the Convention without detracting from its existing achievements. Such a process would have the advantage that the negotiators could re-examine the most appropriate nomination and inscription procedures for ABNJ sites as well as further develop the ‘system of international cooperation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve and identify that heritage’ as envisaged by Article 7 of the Convention.

⁴³ See Freestone, D. and Oude Elferink, A. G., Flexibility and innovation in the law of the sea: will the LOS Convention amendment procedures ever be used? in A. G. Oude Elferink (ed.). 2005. *Stability and Change in the Law of the Sea: The Role of the LOS Convention* pp. 163-216, 184-86.

⁴⁴ UNGA Res. 48/263 (28 July 1994) approved with 121 for, 0 against and 7 abstentions.

⁴⁵ Article 4(1), 1994. Agreement relating to the Implementation of Part XI of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, 28 July 1994. (1995) 33 *International Legal Materials* 1309.

⁴⁶ There is a recent analogy with the negotiation process of the 1999 Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. For a definitive study of the negotiation of the Protocol, see Toman, J. 2009. *Cultural Property in War: Improvement in Protection*, Paris, UNESCO.

5. Management and protection of Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas



A remotely operated vehicle (ROV) is brought back on board after a dive deep into the Canada Basin.
Image courtesy of the NOAA Office of Ocean Exploration and Research, 2005 Hidden Ocean Expedition

Inscription of a site on the World Heritage List is but a first step. Central to the Convention are its mechanisms to monitor the state of conservation of the OUV of sites and assist countries to secure their long term protection. Therefore, apart from the issues related to nomination and inscription of World Heritage sites in marine ABNJ, a central question relates to the protection of their OUV once they are recognized. Below are some preliminary reflections on this issue.

Although currently existing management measures in ABNJ are largely sectoral and rather fragmented, these areas are not totally ungoverned.⁴⁷ There is a relatively large range of specialist organizations whose specific tasks include

coordinating member states' management of human activities in ABNJ over which they have jurisdiction. Although the organizations do not have specific mandates to protect natural or cultural heritage, under particular agreements member states do have some obligations regarding the conservation and management of resources in ABNJ. For example, the ISA is the organization 'through which States Parties shall . . . organize and control activities in the Area, particularly with a view to administering resources . . .' in accordance with Part XI.⁴⁸

UNCLOS also provides that activities '*be carried out for the benefit of mankind as a whole, irrespective of the*

⁴⁷ See Freestone, D. 2016. Governance of areas beyond national jurisdiction: an unfinished agenda? in *The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea: A Living*

Treaty? London, British Institute of International and Comparative Law, pp. 231-66.

⁴⁸ Article 157 UNCLOS

geographical location of states...’;⁴⁹ the International Maritime Organization (IMO) which coordinates the Member States’ regulation of international vessel traffic, safety and vessel source pollution in the marine environment including the ABNJ; the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the wide range of RFMOs are the organizations in which member states coordinate the conservation and management of fisheries’ resources in ABNJ. The effectiveness of these organizations largely depends on flag state and port state enforcement. Regulatory measures are developed by the organizations but compliance with these measures is primarily the responsibility of the Members States themselves, either individually or jointly.

States may exercise jurisdiction over activities in ABNJ when those activities are conducted by vessels flying their flag or by persons or legal entities – such as companies – which hold their nationality. They may not, however, exercise jurisdiction over vessels flying the flag of other nations or over foreign nationals unless those other nations have agreed, usually by treaty, to allow reciprocal enforcement. So that, for example, the member states of a RFMO can agree to recognize the authority of the coast guard or navy vessels of other Member States to enforce the legally binding conservation measures of the RFMO against their own vessels.⁵⁰ Port states may also inspect foreign vessels calling into their ports to ensure that they are in compliance with international agreements to which the flag state is party.⁵¹

The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS) has reinforced the legal duties that a flag state has to supervise closely the activities of its vessels, nationals and those acting under its authority. In a groundbreaking Advisory Opinion of 2011 rendered at the request of the ISA, the Seabed Disputes Chamber of ITLOS found that states that sponsor activities relating to exploration and exploitation of the deep seabed – i.e. in ABNJ – are under the highest duty of due diligence to ensure that the entities they sponsor comply with the best possible environmental practices.⁵² This duty cannot be avoided.

Building on that Opinion, in 2015 the full Tribunal examined the obligations of states in relation to fishing vessels flying

their flags.⁵³ The Tribunal ruled that ‘the flag State, in fulfilment of its responsibility to exercise effective jurisdiction and control in administrative matters, must adopt the necessary administrative measures to ensure that fishing vessels flying its flag are not involved in activities which will undermine the flag State’s responsibilities under the Convention in respect of the conservation and management of marine living resources.’⁵⁴

The Tribunal also reminded us that it had already found in a previous case that a flag state’s obligation under Art 192 of UNCLOS to ‘protect and preserve the marine environment’ includes ‘conservation of the living resources of the sea.’⁵⁵ Therefore flag states are obliged to take the necessary measures to ensure that their nationals and vessels flying their flag are not involved in IUU fishing activities in the EEZ of another state.⁵⁶ Although this Opinion only related to the EEZ, the same principles would be applicable on the High Seas.

These examples are intended to illustrate that it is quite feasible for the Member States of the 1972 World Heritage Convention to agree among themselves a regime for the protection of inscribed sites in marine ABNJ. The chosen regime would focus on the protection of those flagship marine areas that are recognized for their OUV and as such are inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List. They can also agree to collaborate with existing international sectoral organizations with relevant competences. For example, the International Seabed Authority in relation to a seabed site in the Area⁵⁷ or an RFMO in relation to a high seas site recognized for its fish species aggregations of OUV. In this regard, the mechanisms developed by the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage are of particular interest and provide a useful precedent.⁵⁸

The 2001 Convention provides a collaborative regime among Member States for the protection of underwater cultural heritage (UCH) in the Area – i.e. in ABNJ – which involves UNESCO and the International Seabed Authority.⁵⁹ Under Articles 11 and 12, all States Parties have a responsibility to protect UCH in the Area⁶⁰ and also have obligations to ensure that their nationals – or the masters of ships flying

49 Article 140(1) UNCLOS.

50 See for example under Article 21, 1995 United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement (1995) 34 *International Legal Materials* 1542; there are also examples of reciprocal High Seas boarding inspection schemes under the Western Central Pacific Fisheries Commission and South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization.

51 There is a network of ‘Memoranda of Understanding’ (MOUs) between the port states of each region of the oceans where the States of the region each undertake to inspect a certain percentage of vessels visiting their ports to ensure they comply with international obligations agreed by the IMO regarding ship safety, pollution control, etc. The 2009 Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (Port State Measures Agreement) negotiated under the auspices of the FAO recognizes *inter alia* port state rights to inspect vessels suspected of IUU fishing (in force 2016). At <http://www.fao.org/fishery/psm/agreement/en>

52 *Responsibilities and Obligations of States Sponsoring Persons and Entities with Respect to Activities in the Area*, Case No. 17, Advisory Opinion (ITLOS Seabed Disputes Chamber Feb. 1, 2011), at <http://www.itlos.org/>

53 *Request for an Advisory Opinion submitted by the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission (SRFC)*, Case 21, International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS), 2 April 2015. At <http://www.itlos.org/>

54 Advisory Opinion (AO), Para 119

55 *Southern Bluefin Tuna (New Zealand v. Japan; Australia v. Japan)*, Provisional Measures, Order of 27 August, 1999, ITLOS Reports 1999, 280, at p. 295, para. 70.

56 XXX

57 Article 1(1) UNCLOS reads: ‘“Area” means the seabed and ocean floor and subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.’

58 UNESCO (2001) Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage adopted by the General Conference at its 31st session, Paris, 2 November 2001. 48 *Law of the Sea Bulletin* 29 (in force 2 January 2009). Text at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001246/124687e.pdf#page=56>

59 See Dromgoole, S. 2013. *Underwater Cultural Heritage and International Law*, Cambridge (UK), CUP, pp. 294-98.

60 This is consistent with framework of the UNCLOS, particularly Articles 149 and 303(1).

their flags - report to it any discovery of UCH or any intention 'to engage in activities directed at underwater cultural heritage located in the Area.'⁶¹ The State Party then reports these activities to both the Director-General of UNESCO and the Secretary-General of the ISA. The Director-General then makes this information available to all States Parties so that they may declare an interest in the UCH in the Area. Interested states then collaborate on how to best protect the UCH, and appoint a 'Coordinating State' to implement or organize agreed protection measures in consultation with the ISA if it accepted the invitation of the Director-General. It is recognized that any and all Member States have the authority to 'take all practicable measures in conformity with the Convention ... to prevent any immediate danger to the [UCH], whether arising from human activities or any other cause including looting'⁶² prior to the selection of the Coordinating State and protective measures to be implemented through authorization system. In coordinating consultations, taking measures, conducting preliminary research, and/or issuing authorizations, the Coordinating State shall act for the benefit of humanity as a whole, on behalf of all States Parties.⁶³

A central force of the 1972 Convention is its capacity to call upon the international community to safeguard a site when its unique values are severely threatened by inscribing the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger or by stripping a site of its World Heritage status when its OUV is irrevocably lost. In particular, the risk of potential listing of a site 'in Danger' has proved highly effective in the form of an 'alert system' that ensures the necessary attention of the international community to put the necessary measures in place that will secure the preservation of a site's unique values. Numerous examples exist where such an alarm has prevented an irrevocable loss of a unique and irreplaceable part of our world heritage.

“A central force of the 1972 Convention is its capacity to call upon the international community to safeguard a site when its unique values are severely threatened...”

61 Article 11(1) 2001 Convention

62 Article 12(3) 2001 Convention

63 Consistent with UNCLOS Article 149, particular regard shall be paid to the preferential rights of States of cultural, historical or archaeological origin in respect of the underwater cultural heritage concerned.

6. Concluding remarks



Divers make an underwater star.
© Cyber Eak/Shutterstock.com

Nothing in the inspirational vision of the 1972 World Heritage Convention suggests that nature or culture heritage of OUV which is located in marine ABNJ should be excluded from this protection. Indeed, it would be strange if more or less half of the world were to be excluded from what is indicated as ‘World Heritage’.

In summary, there are three potentially feasible scenarios for the application of the 1972 Convention to include World Heritage sites in ABNJ:

- 1) Bold interpretation of the Convention, either through incremental change or a formal policy change;
- 2) Amendment outside the terms of the 1972 Agreement akin to the 1994 Part XI Implementing Agreement to UNCLOS; and
- 3) An optional protocol to the 1972 Convention developed through an international negotiation among States

Parties, binding only on those States that choose to ratify any resulting protocol.

Under any scenario, a system for the protection of World Heritage sites in areas beyond national jurisdiction will need to be elaborated, both in conjunction with the relevant competent international organizations and their States Parties, and in coordination with potential procedures for marine protected areas developed for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in ABNJ pursuant to any new international instrument under UNCLOS.

The criteria for defining the OUV of potential World Heritage sites go beyond biodiversity to include, for example, ‘geological and physiographical formations’ and sites of historic, archaeological or cultural value. So the discussions within the United Nations in New York of a new agreement under UNCLOS would not supersede the need for discussions within the framework of the World Heritage Convention.

4

PART IV: ANNEXES



A juvenile of a sawtooth eel, *Serrivomer* sp. (Serrivomeridae).
© Sönke Johnsen

ANNEX I:

References

PART I Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas: why does it matter?

Francioni, F. and Lenzerini, F. (eds). 2008. *The 1972 World Heritage Convention: a Commentary*, OUP, pp. 3-4.

IUCN. 2013. *Marine Natural Heritage and the World Heritage List interpretation of World Heritage criteria in marine systems, analysis of biogeographic representation of sites, and a roadmap for addressing gaps*. https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/marine_natural_heritage_and_the_world_heritage_list.pdf

Laffoley, D. and Langley, J. 2010. *Bahrain Action Plan for Marine World Heritage. Identifying Priorities and enhancing the role of the World Heritage Convention in the IUCN-WCPA Marine Global Plan of Action for MPAs in our Oceans and Seas*. Switzerland, IUCN. <http://whc.unesco.org/document/105357>

Spalding, M. 2012. *Marine World Heritage: Toward a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List*. World Heritage Centre, Paris, UNESCO. <http://whc.unesco.org/document/117645>

UNESCO. 1972. Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage adopted by the General Conference at its 17th session, Paris, 16 November 1972: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/>

WHC-96/CONF.202/INF.9. Paris, 15 April 1996. <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/1996/whc-96-conf202-inf9e.pdf>

WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A. Paris, 27 May 2011, p. 24. <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2011/whc11-35com-9Ae1.pdf>

PART II Potential Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas

Abdulla, A., Obura, D., Bertzky, B. and Shi, Y. 2013. *Marine Natural Heritage and the World Heritage List Interpretation of World Heritage criteria in marine systems, analysis of biogeographic representation of sites, and a roadmap for addressing gaps*. Gland, Switzerland, IUCN. https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/marine_natural_heritage_and_the_world_heritage_list.pdf

Obura, D. O., Church, J. E. and Gabrié, C. 2012. Assessing Marine World Heritage from an Ecosystem Perspective: The Western Indian Ocean. World Heritage Centre, United Nations Education, Science and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). 124 pp. <http://whc.unesco.org/document/117644>

UNESCO World Heritage Centre. 2015. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris, UNESCO (WHC.15/01) <http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines>

Part II The Lost City Hydrothermal Field

Allen, D. E. and Seyfried, W. E. 2004. Serpentinization and heat generation: constraints from Lost City and Rainbow hydrothermal systems. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 68, No.6, pp. 1347-54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2003.09.003>

Boetius, A. 2005. Lost city life. *Science*, Vol. 307, No. 5714, pp. 1420-22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1109849>

Bradley, A. S., Hayes, J. M., and Summons, R. E. 2009. Extraordinary ^{13}C enrichment of diether lipids at the Lost City Hydrothermal Field indicates a carbon-

- limited ecosystem. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 73, No. 1, pp. 102-118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2008.10.005>
- Bradley, A. S., Fredricks, H., Hinrichs, K. U. and Summons, R. E. 2009. Structural diversity of diether lipids in carbonate chimneys at the Lost City Hydrothermal Field. *Organic Geochemistry*, Vol. 40, No. 12, pp. 1169-1178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.orggeochem.2009.09.004>
- Bradley, A. S. and Summons, R. E. 2010. Multiple origins of methane at the Lost City Hydrothermal Field. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, Vol. 297, No. 1, pp. 34-41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2010.05.034>
- Brazelton, W. J., Schrenk, M. O., Kelley, D. S. and Baross, J. A. 2006. Methane-and sulfur-metabolizing microbial communities dominate the Lost City hydrothermal field ecosystem. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, Vol. 72, No. 9, pp. 6257-6270. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00574-06>
- DeChaine, E. G., Bates, A. E., Shank, T. M. and Cavanaugh, C. M. 2006. Off-axis symbiosis found: characterization and biogeography of bacterial symbionts of *Bathymodiolus* mussels from Lost City hydrothermal vents. *Environmental microbiology*, Vol. 8, No. 11, pp. 1902-1912. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2005.01113.x>
- Delacour, A., Früh-Green, G. L., Bernasconi, S. M., Schaeffer, P. and Kelley, D. S. 2008. Carbon geochemistry of serpentinites in the Lost City Hydrothermal System (30 N, MAR). *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 72, No. 15, pp. 3681-3702. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2008.04.039>
- Edwards, K. J., Bach, W., and McCollom, T. M. 2005. Geomicrobiology in oceanography: microbe-mineral interactions at and below the seafloor. *TRENDS in Microbiology*, Vol. 13, No. 9, pp. 449-456. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2005.07.005>
- Foustoukos, D. I., Savov, I. P., and Janecky, D. R. 2008. Chemical and isotopic constraints on water/rock interactions at the Lost City hydrothermal field, 30 N Mid-Atlantic Ridge. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 72, No. 22, pp. 5457-5474. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2008.07.035>
- Früh-Green, et al.. 2003. 30,000 years of hydrothermal activity at the Lost City vent field. *Science*, Vol. 301, No. 5632, pp. 495-498. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1085582>
- Govenar, B., Le Bris, N., Gollner, S., Glanville, J., Aperghis, A. B., Hourdez, S. and Fisher, C. R. 2005. Epifaunal community structure associated with *Riftia pachyptila* aggregations in chemically different hydrothermal vent habitats. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, Vol. 305, pp. 66-77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps305067>
- Haymon, R. M. et al. 1991. Hydrothermal vent distribution along the East Pacific Rise crest (9°09'–54'N) and its relationship to magmatic and tectonic processes on fast-spreading mid-ocean ridges. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, Vol. 104, No. 2-4, pp. 513-34. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0012821X91902268>
- Haymon, R. M. et al. 1993. Volcanic eruption of the mid-ocean ridge along the East Pacific Rise crest at 9°45'–52'N: Direct submersible observations of seafloor phenomena associated with an eruption event in April, 1991. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, Vol. 119, No. 1-2, pp. 85-101. <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0012821X9390008W>
- Johnson, S. B., Warén, A. and Vrijenhoek, R. C. 2008. DNA barcoding of *Lepetodrilus* limpets reveals cryptic species. *Journal of Shellfish Research*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 43-51. http://www.mbari.org/staff/vrijen/PDFS/Johnson_2008_JSR.pdf
- Kelley, D. S., Karson, J. A., Blackman, D. K., Früh-Green, G. L., Butterfield, D. A., Lilley, M. D. and Rivizzigno, P. 2001. An off-axis hydrothermal vent field near the Mid-Atlantic Ridge at 30 N. *Nature*, Vol. 412, No. 6843, pp. 145-149. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/35084000>
- Kelley, D. S., Karson, J. A., Früh-Green, G. L., Yoerger, D. R., Shank, T. M., Butterfield, D. A., ... and Sylva, S. P. 2005. A serpentinite-hosted ecosystem: the Lost City hydrothermal field. *Science*, Vol. 307, No. 5714, pp. 1428-1434. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1102556>
- Kelley, D. S., Früh-Green, G. L., Karson, J. A. and Ludwig, K.A. 2007. *The Lost City Hydrothermal Field Revisited*. *Oceanography*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 90-99.
- Konn, C., Charlou, J. L., Donval, J. P., Holm, N. G., Dehairs, F. and Bouillon, S. 2009. Hydrocarbons and oxidized organic compounds in hydrothermal fluids from Rainbow and Lost City ultramafic-hosted vents. *Chemical Geology*, Vol. 258, No. 3, pp. 299-314. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2008.10.034>
- Lang, S. Q., Butterfield, D. A., Schulte, M., Kelley, D. S., and Lilley, M. D. 2010. Elevated concentrations of formate, acetate and dissolved organic carbon found at the Lost City hydrothermal field. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 74, No. 3, pp. 941-952. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2009.10.045>

- Le Bris, N. and Gaill, F. 2007. How does the annelid *Alvinella pompejana* deal with an extreme hydrothermal environment? *Life in Extreme Environments*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 315-39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11157-006-9112-1>
- López-García, P., Vereshchaka, A. and Moreira, D. 2007. Eukaryotic diversity associated with carbonates and fluid-seawater interface in Lost City hydrothermal field. *Environmental Microbiology*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 546-554.
- Lowell, R. P. and Rona, P. A. 2002. Seafloor hydrothermal systems driven by the serpentinization of peridotite. *Geophysical Research Letters*, Vol. 29, No. 11, pp. 26-1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2001GL014411>
- Ludwig, K. A., Kelley, D. S., Butterfield, D. A., Nelson, B. K. and Früh-Green, G. 2006. Formation and evolution of carbonate chimneys at the Lost City Hydrothermal Field. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 70, No. 14, pp. 3625-3645. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2006.04.016>
- Ludwig, K. A., Shen, C. C., Kelley, D. S., Cheng, H. and Edwards, R. L. 2011. U-Th systematics and 230 Th ages of carbonate chimneys at the Lost City Hydrothermal Field. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 75, No. 7, pp. 1869-1888. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2011.01.008>
- Macdonald, K. et al. 1980. Hydrothermal heat flux of the "black smoker" vents on the East Pacific Rise. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, Vol. 48, No.1, pp.1-7. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X\(80\)90163-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0012-821X(80)90163-6)
- Martin, W. and Russell, M. J. 2007. On the origin of biochemistry at an alkaline hydrothermal vent. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 362, No. 1486, pp. 1887-1926. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2006.1881>
- Martin, W., Baross, J., Kelley, D. and Russell, M. J. 2008. Hydrothermal vents and the origin of life. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, Vol. 6, No. 11, pp. 805-814. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro1991>
- Proskurowski, G., Lilley, M. D., Kelley, D. S. and Olson, E. J. 2006. Low temperature volatile production at the Lost City Hydrothermal Field, evidence from a hydrogen stable isotope geothermometer. *Chemical Geology*, Vol. 229, No. 4, pp. 331-343. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2005.11.005>
- Proskurowski, G., Lilley, M. D., Seewald, J. S., Früh-Green, G. L., Olson, E. J., Lupton, J. E., ... and Kelley, D. S. 2008. Abiogenic hydrocarbon production at Lost City hydrothermal field. *Science*, Vol. 319, No. 5863, pp. 604-607. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1151194>
- Schrenk, M. O., Kelley, D. S., Bolton, S. A., and Baross, J. A. 2004. Low archaeal diversity linked to subseafloor geochemical processes at the Lost City Hydrothermal Field, Mid-Atlantic Ridge. *Environmental Microbiology*, Vol. 6, No. 10, pp. 1086-1095. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2004.00650.x>
- Shank, T. M. et al. 1998. Temporal and spatial patterns of biological community development at nascent deep-sea hydrothermal vents (9°50'N, East Pacific Rise). *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, Vol. 45, No. 1-3, pp.465-515. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0645\(97\)00089-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0645(97)00089-1)
- Sohn, R. A., Hildebrand, J. A. and Webb, S. C. 1999. A microearthquake survey of the high-temperature vent fields on the volcanically active East Pacific Rise (9°50' N). *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, Vol. 104, No. B11, pp. 25367-77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/1999JB900263>
- Toomey, D. R., Joussetin, D., Dunn, R. A., Wilcock, W. S. and Detrick, R. S. 2007. Skew of mantle upwelling beneath the East Pacific Rise governs segmentation. *Nature*, Vol. 446, No.7134, pp. 409-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature05679>
- Von Damm, K. L., Buttermore, L. G., Oosting, S. E., Bray, A. M., Fornari, D. J., Lilley, M. D. and Shanks, W. C. 1997. Direct observation of the evolution of a seafloor 'black smoker' from vapor to brine. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, Vol. 149, No. 1-4, pp. 101-11. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X\(97\)00059-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0012-821X(97)00059-9)
- Von Damm, K. L. 2001. Lost city found. *Nature*, Vol. 412, No. 6843, pp. 127-128.
- Xie, W., Wang, F., Guo, L., Chen, Z., Sievert, S. M., Meng, J., ... and Xu, A. 2011. Comparative metagenomics of microbial communities inhabiting deep-sea hydrothermal vent chimneys with contrasting chemistries. *The ISME journal*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 414-426. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2010.144>

Part II The Costa Rica Thermal Dome

- Alexander, M. A., Seo, H., Xie, S. P., and Scott, J. D. 2012. ENSO's Impact on the Gap Wind Regions of the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean. *Journal of Climate*, Vol. 25, No. 10, pp. 3549-3565. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00320.1>
- Bailey, H., Mate, B. R., Palacios, D. M., Irvine, L., Bograd, S. J. and Costa D. P. 2009. Behavioural estimation of blue whale movements in the Northeast Pacific from state-space model analysis of satellite tracks. *Endangered*

- Species Research*. Vol. 10, pp. 93-106.
http://www.who.edu/cms/files/BaileyPreprint_BlueWhale_57185.pdf
- Bailey, H., Benson, S. R., Shillinger, G. L., Bograd, S. J., Dutton P. H., Eckert S. A., Morreale S. J., Paladino F. V., Eguchi T., Foley, D. G., Block, B. A., Piedra, R., Hitipeuw, C., Tapilatu, R. F. and Spotila, J. R. 2012. Identification of distinct movement patterns in Pacific leatherback turtle populations influenced by ocean conditions. *Ecological Applications*, Vol. 22, pp. 735-747.
- Ballance, L. T., Pitman, R. L., and Fiedler, P. C. 2006. Oceanographic influences on seabirds and cetaceans of the eastern tropical Pacific: A review. *Progress in Oceanography*, Vol. 69, No. 2-4, pp. 360-390. doi:10.1016/j.pocean.2006.03.013. <https://swfsc.noaa.gov/uploadedFiles/Divisions/PRD/Programs/Ecology/Ballanceetal2006PIO.pdf>
- Ballesterio, D. and Coen, E. 2004. Generation and propagation of anticyclonic rings in the Gulf of Papagayo, Costa Rica. *Int.J. Remote Sensing*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 1-8.
- Ballesterio, D. 2006. El Domo Térmico de Costa Rica. Capítulo VI in *Ambientes marino costeros de Costa Rica*. Informe Técnico. Nielsen-Muñoz, Vanessa, Quesada-Alpizar, Marco A. eds. Comisión Interdisciplinaria Marino Costera de la Zona Económica Exclusiva de Costa Rica, San José, C.R. http://www.mespinozamen.com/uploads/4/5/7/6/4576162/infome_tecnico_ambientes_marinos_cr-czee_2006.pdf
- Broenkow, W. W. 1965. The distribution of nutrients in the Costa Rica Dome in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. *Limnology and Oceanography*, Vol. 10, pp. 40-52. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.4319/lo.1965.10.1.0040/pdf>
- Calambokidis, J. and Barlow, J. 2004. Abundance of blue and humpback whales in the Eastern North Pacific estimated by capture-recapture and line-transect methods. *Marine Mammal Science*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 63-85. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usdeptcommercepub/246/>
- Chavez, F. P. and Barber, R. T. 1987. An estimate of new production in the equatorial Pacific. *Deep-sea research. Part A. Oceanographic research papers*, Vol. 34, No. 7, pp. 1229-1243. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0198-0149\(87\)90073-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0198-0149(87)90073-2)
- Cromwell, T. 1958. Thermocline topography, horizontal currents and "ridging" in the eastern tropical Pacific. Bulletin Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission 111, pp. 135-164.
- Fiedler, P. C. 2002. The annual cycle and biological effects of the Costa Rica Dome. *Deep-Sea Research I: Oceanographic Research Papers*, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 321-38. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0637\(01\)00057-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0637(01)00057-7)
- Halpern, B. S., Walbridge, S., Selkoe, K. A., Kappel, C. V., Micheli, F., D'Agrosa, C., Bruno, J. F., Casey, K. S., Ebert, C., Fox, H. E., Fujita, R., Heinemann, D., Lenihan, H. S., Madin, E. M. P., Perry, M. T., Selig, E. R., Spalding, M., Steneck, R. and Watson, R. 2008. A global map of human impact on marine ecosystems. *Science*, Vol. 319, No. 5868, pp. 319, 948-952. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1149345>
- Hofmann, E. E., Busalacchi, A. J. and O'Brien, J. J. 1981. Wind generation of the Costa Rica Dome. *Science*, Vol. 214, pp. 552-554.
- Hoyt, E. 2009A. The Blue Whale, *Balaenoptera musculus*: An endangered species thriving on the Costa Rica Dome. An illustration submitted to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Available online at <http://www.cbd.int/cms/ui/forums/attachment.aspx?id=73..>
- Hoyt, E. and Tetley, M. 2011. The Costa Rica Dome: Building a case for place-based management of blue whales on the high seas. An abstract submitted to the 2nd International Conference on Marine Mammal Protected Areas, Martinique, 7-11 November 2011.
- Kahru, M., Fiedler, P. C., Gille, S. T., Manzano, M., and Mitchell, B. G. 2007. Sea level anomalies control phytoplankton biomass in the Costa Rica Dome area. *Geophysical Research Letters*, Vol. 34, No. 22, pp. 1-5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2007GL031631>
- Kessler, W. S. 2006. The circulation of the eastern tropical Pacific: A review. *Progress in Oceanography*, Vol. 69, pp. 181-217.
- Mate B. R., Lagerquist, B. A. and Calambokidis, J. 1999. Movements of North Pacific blue whales during the feeding season off Southern California and their Southern fall migration. *Marine Mammal Science*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 1246-1257. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.1999.tb00888.x>
- Matteson, R. S. 2009. The Costa Rica Dome: A Study of Physics, Zooplankton and Blue Whales. Thesis for a Master of Science Degree in Oceanography, submitted to Oregon State University, USA, October 22, 2009. https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1957/13984/MattesonRobynS2009_thesis.pdf?sequence=1
- McClain, C. R., Christian, J. R., Signorini, S. R., Lewis, M. R., Asanuma, I., Turk, D. and Dupouy-Douchement, C. 2002. Satellite ocean-color observations of

- the tropical Pacific Ocean. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, Vol. 49, No. 13-14, pp. 2533–2560. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.1999.tb00888.x>
- Lumpkin, R. and G. C. Johnson 2013. Global ocean surface velocities from drifters: Mean, variance, El Niño–Southern Oscillation response, and seasonal cycle, *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, Vol. 118, pp. 2992–3006, doi:10.1002/jgrc.20210. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jgrc.20210/abstract>
- Palacios, D. M., Bograd, S. J., Foley, D. G. and Schwing, F. B. 2006. Oceanographic characteristics of biological hot spots in the North Pacific: A remote sensing perspective. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, Vol. 53, No. 3-4, pp. 250-269. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2006.03.004>
- Rolland, R. M., Parks, S. E., Hunt, K. E., Castellote, M., Corkeron, P. J., Nowacek, D. P., Wasser, S. K. and Kraus, S.D. 2012. Evidence that ship noise increases stress in right whales. *Proc. R. Soc. B*, Vol. 276, No. 1737, pp. 1471-2954. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2011.2429>
- Saito, M. A., Rocab, G. and Moffett, J. W. 2005. Production of cobalt binding ligands in a *Synechococcus* feature at the Costa Rica upwelling dome. *Limnology and Oceanography*, Vol. 50, No. 1, pp. 279-290. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.4319/lo.2005.50.1.0279/pdf>
- Shillinger, G. L., Swithenbank, A. M., Bailey, H., Bograd, S. J., Castleton, M. R., Wallace, B. P., Spotila, J. R., Paladino, F. V., Piedra, R. and Block, B. A. 2011. Vertical and horizontal habitat preferences of post-nesting leatherback turtles in the South Pacific Ocean. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, Vol. 422, pp. 275-289. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps08884>
- Shillinger, G. L., Di Lorenzo, E., Luo, H., Bograd, S. J., Hazen, E. L., Bailey, H. and Spotila, J. R. 2012. On the dispersal of leatherback turtle hatchlings from Meso-American nesting beaches. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, Vol. 279, pp. 2391-2395.
- Tetley, M. J. and Hoyt, E. 2012. A Big Blue network: building a case for place-based management of blue whales on the high seas. Abstract, European Cetacean Society, 26th Annual Conference ECS, Galway, Ireland, p. 217.
- Vilchis, L. I., Ballance, L. T. and Fiedler, P. C. 2006. Pelagic habitat of seabirds in the eastern tropical Pacific: effects of foraging ecology on habitat selection. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, Vol. 315, pp. 279-292. <https://swfsc.noaa.gov/uploadedFiles/Divisions/PRD/Programs/Ecology/Vilchisetal2006MEPS.pdf>
- Wyrski, K. 1964. Upwelling in the Costa Rica Dome. *Fishery Bulletin*, Vol. 63, No. 2, pp. 355–372. <http://fishbull.noaa.gov/63-2/wyrski.pdf>
- Xie, S. -P., Xu, H., Kessler, W. S. and Nonaka, M. 2005. Air–Sea Interaction over the Eastern Pacific Warm Pool: Gap Winds, thermocline Dome, and Atmospheric Convection. *J. Climate*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 5–20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-3249.1>

Part II The White Shark Café

- Anderson, S. D., Chapple, T. K., Jorgensen, S. J., Klimley, A. P. and Block, B. A. 2011. Long-term individual identification and site fidelity of white sharks, *Carcharodon carcharias*, off California using dorsal fins. *Mar. Biol.* Vol. 158, pp. 1233–1237. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00227-011-1643-5>
- Block, B. A., Jonsen, I. D., Jorgensen, S. J., Winship, A. J., Shaffer, S. A., Bograd, S. J., Hazen, E. L., Foley, D. G., Breed, G. A., Harrison, A.-L., Ganong, J. E., Swithenbank, A., Castleton, M., Dewar, H., Mate, B. R., Shillinger, G. L., Schaefer, K. M., Benson, S. R., Weise, M. J., Henry, R. W. and Costa, D. P. 2011. Tracking apex marine predator movements in a dynamic ocean. *Nature*, Vol. 475, pp. 86–90. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature10082>
- Boustany, A. M., Davis, S. F., Pyle, P., Anderson, S. D., Boeuf, B. J. L. and Block, B. A. 2002. Satellite tagging: Expanded niche for white sharks. *Nature*, Vol. 415, pp. 35–36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/415035b>
- Cailliet, G. M., Natanson, L. J., Weldon, B. A. and Ebert, D. A. 1985. Preliminary studies on the age and growth of the white shark, *Carcharodon carcharias*, using vertebral bands. *Mem. South. Calif. Acad. Sci.* Vol. 9, pp. 49–60.
- Carlisle, A. B., Kim, S. L., Semmens, B. X., Madigan, D. J., Jorgensen, S. J., Perle, C. R., Anderson, S. D., Chapple, T. K., Kanive, P. E. and Block, B. A. 2012. Using stable isotope analysis to understand the migration and trophic ecology of northeastern pacific white sharks (*Carcharodon carcharias*). *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 7, e30492. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0030492>
- Chapple, T. K., Jorgensen, S. J., Anderson, S. D., Kanive, P. E., Klimley, A. P., Botsford, L. W. and Block, B. A. 2011. A first estimate of white shark, *Carcharodon carcharias*, abundance off Central California. *Biology Letters*, Vol. 7, pp. 581–583. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2011.0124>

- Chapple, T. K. and Botsford, L. W. 2013. A comparison of linear demographic models and fraction of lifetime egg production for assessing sustainability in sharks. *Conserv. Biol.* Vol. 27, pp. 560–568. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12053>
- Domeier, M. and Nasby-Lucas, N. 2008. Migration patterns of white sharks *Carcharodon carcharias* tagged at Guadalupe Island, Mexico, and identification of an eastern Pacific shared offshore foraging area. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, Vol. 370, pp. 221–237.
- Domeier, M., Nasby-Lucas, N. and Palacios, D. 2012. The Northeastern Pacific White Shark Shared Offshore Foraging Area (SOFA). *Global Perspectives on the Biology and Life History of the White Shark* pp. 147–158. CRC Press.
- Francis, M. P. 1996. Observations on a pregnant white shark with a review of reproductive biology. p. 157–172. In *Great White Sharks: the biology of Carcharodon carcharias*. Academic Press, Inc., New York.
- Gubili, C., Bilgin, R., Kalkan, E., Karhan, S. Ü., Jones, C. S., Sims, D. W., et al. 2010. Antipodean white sharks on a Mediterranean walkabout? Historical dispersal leads to genetic discontinuity and an endangered anomalous population. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* Vol. 278, No. 1712, pp.1679–86. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21084352>
- Gubili, C., Duffy, C. A. J., Cliff, G., Wintner, S. P., Shivji, M., Chapman, D., et al. 2012. "Application of molecular genetics for conservation of the great White Shark, *Carcharodon carcharias*, L. 1758," in *Global Perspectives on the Biology and Life History of the White Shark* (CRC Press), pp. 357–380. <http://www.crcnetbase.com/doi/abs/10.1201/b11532-16>
- Jorgensen, S. J., Reeb, C. A., Chapple, T. K., Anderson, S., Perle, C., Sommeran, V. R. S., et al. 2010. Philopatry and migration of pacific white sharks. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* Vol. 277, pp. 679–688. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2009.1155>
- Jorgensen, S. J., Arnoldi, N. S., Estess, E. E., Chapple, T. K., Rückert, M., Anderson, S. D. and Block, B. A. 2012a. Eating or Meeting? Cluster Analysis Reveals Intricacies of White Shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*) Migration and Offshore Behavior. *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 7, e47819. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0047819>
- Jorgensen, S., Chapple, T., Hoyos, M., Reeb, C. and Block, B. 2012b. Connectivity among White Shark Coastal Aggregation Areas in the Northeastern Pacific. *Global Perspectives on the Biology and Life History of the White Shark*, pp. 159–168. CRC Press.
- Lumpkin, R. and G. C. Johnson 2013. Global ocean surface velocities from drifters: Mean, variance, El Niño–Southern Oscillation response, and seasonal cycle, *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, Vol. 118, pp. 2992–3006, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jgrc.20210>
- Pardini, A. T., Jones, C. S., Noble, L. R., Kreiser, B., Malcolm, H., Bruce, B. D., Stevens, J. D., Cliff, G., Scholl, M. S., Francis, M., Duffy, C. A. J. and Martin A. P. 2001. Sex-biased dispersal of great white sharks. *Nature*, Vol. 412, pp.139–140. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/35084125>
- Tanaka, S., Kitamura, T., Mochizuki, T. and Kofuji, K. 2011. Age, growth and genetic status of the white shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*) from Kashima-nada, Japan. *Mar. Freshw. Res.* Vol. 62, pp. 548–556. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/MF10130>
- Teo, S., Boustany, A., Blackwell, S., Walli, A., Weng, K. and Block B. 2004. Validation of geolocation estimates based on light level and sea surface temperature from electronic tags. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* Vol. 283, pp. 81–98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps283081>
- Weng, K., Boustany, A., Pyle, P., Anderson, S., Brown, A. and Block, B. 2007. Migration and habitat of white sharks (*Carcharodon carcharias*) in the eastern Pacific Ocean. *Marine Biology*, Vol. 152, pp. 877–894.

Part II The Sargasso Sea

- Freestone, D. and Morrison, K. 2014. The Signing of the Hamilton Declaration on Collaboration for the Conservation of the Sargasso Sea: A new paradigm for high seas conservation? *29 International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 345–362. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/15718085-12341320>
- Freestone, D., Burnett, D. R., de Juvigny, A. L. and Davenport, T. M. 2015. Submarine Telecommunication Cables in the Sargasso Sea 30. *The International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 371–78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/15718085-12341358>
- Freestone, F., Roe, H. et al. 2015. Sargasso Sea, Chapter 50 in *The First Integrated World Ocean Assessment (First World Ocean Assessment)*, United Nations, New York . http://www.un.org/depts/los/global_reporting/WOA_RPROC/Chapter_50.pdf
- Freestone, D. and Bulger, F. 2016. The Sargasso Sea Commission: An innovative approach to the conservation of areas beyond national jurisdiction. 30 *Ocean Yearbook* 80–90.

- Laffoley, D., Roe, H., et al. 2011. *The Protection and Management of The Sargasso Sea: The golden floating rainforest of the Atlantic Ocean. Summary Science and Supporting Evidence Case*. Sargasso Sea Alliance. <http://www.sargassoseacommission.org/storage/documents/Sargasso.Report.9.12.pdf>
- Lumpkin, R. and Johnson, G. J. 2013. Global ocean surface velocities from drifters: Mean, variance, El Niño–Southern Oscillation response, and seasonal cycle. *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, Vol. 118, pp. 2992–3006, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jgrc.20210>
- Verne, J. (author) and Miller, W. J. (trans). 1966. *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea*, Washington Square Press.
- ## Part II The Atlantis Bank
- Ahyong, S. T. 2014. Deep-sea squat lobsters of the *Munidopsis serricornis* complex in the Indo-West Pacific, with descriptions of six new species (Crustacea: Decapoda: Munidopsidae). *Records of the Australian Museum*, Vol. 66, No. 3, pp. 197–216. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.2201-4349.66.2014.1630>
- Amon, D. J., Copley, J. T., Dahlgren, T. G., Horton, T., Kemp, K. M., Rogers, A. D. and Glover, A. G. 2015. Observations of fauna attending wood and bone deployments from two seamounts on the Southwest Indian Ridge. *Deep-Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 1–11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2015.07.003>
- Baines, A. G., Cheadle, M. J., Dick, H. J. B., Hosford Scheirer, A., John, B. E., Kuszniir, N. J. and Matsumoto, T. 2003. Mechanism for generating the anomalous uplift of oceanic core complexes: Atlantis Bank, Southwest Indian Ridge. *Geology*, Vol. 31, No. 12, pp. 1105–1108. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1130/G19829.1>
- Boersch-Supan, P. H., Rogers, A. D. and Brierley, A. S. 2015. Author's Accepted Manuscript. *Deep-Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, pp. 1–40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2015.06.023>
- Clark M. R., Rowden A. A., Schlacher T. A., Guinotte J., Dunstan P. K., Williams A., O'Hara T. D., Watling Les, Niklitschek E. and Tsuchida S. 2014. Identifying Ecologically or Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs): A systematic method and its application to seamounts in the South Pacific Ocean. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, Vol. 91, pp. 65–79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2014.01.016>
- FAO. 2006. Management of demersal fisheries resources of the Southern Indian Ocean. Report of the fourth and fifth Ad Hoc Meetings on Potential Management Initiatives of Deepwater Fisheries Operators in the Southern Indian Ocean (Kameeldrift East, South Africa, 12–19 February 2006 and Albion, Petite Rivière, Mauritius, 26–28 April 2006) including specification of benthic protected areas and a 2006 programme of fisheries research. Compiled by Ross Shotton.
- Komai, T. 2013. A new species of the hippolytid genus *Paralebbeus* Bruce and Chace, 1986 (Crustacea: Decapoda: Caridea) from the Coral Seamount, southwestern Indian Ocean. *Zootaxa*, Vol. 3646, pp. 171–179.
- Lewis, R. L., et al. 2014. Global patterns of marine mammal, seabird, and sea turtle bycatch reveal taxa-specific and cumulative megafauna hotspots. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, Vol. 111, No. 14, pp. 5271–5276. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1318960111>
- Nye, V. 2013. New species of hippolytid shrimps (Crustacea: Decapoda: Caridea: Hippolytidae) from a southwest Indian Ocean seamount. *Zootaxa*, Vol. 3637, No. 2, pp. 101–112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.3637.2.1>
- O'Loughlin, P. M., Mackenzie, M. and VandenSpiegel, D. 2013. New sea cucumber species from the seamounts on the Southwest Indian Ocean Ridge (Echinodermata: Holothuroidea: Aspidochirotida, Elaspodida, Dendrochirotida). *Memoirs of Museum Victoria*, Vol. 70, pp. 37–50. http://museumvictoria.com.au/pages/49228/037-050_mmv70_oloughlin_4.pdf
- Palmiotto, C., Corda, L., Ligl, M., Cipriani, A., Dick, H., Doubille, E., Gasperini, L., Montagna, P., Thil, F., Borsetti, A.M., Balestra, B. and Bonatti, E. 2013. Nonvolcanic tectonic islands in ancient and modern oceans. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems*, Vol. 14, No. 10, pp. 4698–4717. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ggge.20279>
- Robel, A. A., Lozier M. S., Gary S. F., Shillinger G. L., Bailey H. and Bograd S. J. 2011. Projecting uncertainty onto marine megafauna trajectories. *Deep-Sea Research Part I*, Vol. 58, pp. 915–921. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2011.06.009>
- Rogers, A. D. 2012. Evolution and biodiversity of Antarctic organisms a molecular perspective, Antarctic Ecosystems. John Wiley and Sons Ltd., pp. 417–467. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781444347241.ch14>
- Rogers, A. D. and Taylor, M. L. 2012. Benthic biodiversity of seamounts in the southwest Indian Ocean Cruise report – R/V James Cook 066 Southwest Indian Ocean Seamounts expedition – November 7th – December 21st, 2011. 235pp.

- Taylor, M. L., Cairns, S., Agnew, D. J. and Rogers, A. D. 2013. A revision of the genus *Thouarella* Gray, 1870 (Octocorallia: Primnoidae), including an illustrated dichotomous key, a new species description, and comments on *Plumarella* Gray, 1870 and *Dasystenella*, Versluys, 1906. *Zootaxa*, Vol. 3602, pp. 1-105. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.3602.1>
- Taylor, M. L. and Rogers, A. D. 2015. Evolutionary dynamics of a common sub-Antarctic octocoral family. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, Vol. 84, pp. 185–204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2014.11.008>
- Yesson, C., Clark, M. R., Taylor, M. and Rogers, A. D. 2011. The global distribution of seamounts based on 30-second bathymetry data. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers*, Vol. 58, No. 4, pp. 442-453. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2011.02.004>
- Part III Recognizing and protecting Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas: how could it work in practice?**
- Cameron, C. and Rössler, M. 2013. *Many Voices, One Vision: The Early Years of the World Heritage Convention*, Farnham (UK), Ashgate, pp. 59-71.
- Dromgoole, S. 2013. *Underwater Cultural Heritage and International Law*, Cambridge (UK), CUP, pp. 294-98.
- Elferink, A. G. (ed.). 2005. *Stability and Change in the Law of the Sea: The Role of the LOS Convention*. Netherlands, Martinus Nijhoff, pp. 163-216, 184-86.
- Francioni, F. and Lenzerini, F. (eds). 2008. *The 1972 World Heritage Convention: A Commentary*. Oxford (UK), Oxford University Press.
- Freestone, D. and Oude Elferink, A. G. 2005. Flexibility and innovation in the law of the sea: will the LOS Convention amendment procedures ever be used? in A. G. Oude Elferink (ed.), *Stability and Change in the Law of the Sea: The Role of the LOS Convention* pp. 163-216, 184-86.
- Freestone, D. 2010. Fisheries, Commissions and Organizations, *Max Plank Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, Oxford (UK), OUP, p. 5.
- Freestone, D. 2016. Governance of areas beyond national jurisdiction: an unfinished agenda? in *The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea: A Living Treaty?* London, British Institute of International and Comparative Law, pp. 231-66.
- Toman, J. 2009. *Cultural Property in War: Improvement in Protection*. Paris, UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 1949. *The Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions covered by the terms of Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Constitution*. Adopted by the General Conference at its 5th session, and amended at its 7th, 17th, 25th, 32nd and 35th sessions.
- UNESCO. 1972. Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage adopted by the General Conference at its 17th session, Paris, 16 November 1972. 11 *International Legal Materials* 1358.
- UNESCO. 1972. Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage adopted by the General Conference at its 17th session, Paris, 16 November 1972.
- UNESCO. 2001. Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage adopted by the General Conference at its 31st session, Paris, 2 November 2001. 48 *Law of the Sea Bulletin* 29.
- UNESCO. 2011. Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A). Paris, 27 May 2011, p. 24.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre. 2015. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris, UNESCO (WHC.15/01) <http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines>
- UNGA Res. 69/292 (19 June 2015).
- UNGA Res. 48/263 (28 July 1994).
- United Nations. 1969. Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, *United Nations Treaty Series [UNTS]*, vol. 1155, p. 331. Adopted 23 May 1969.
- United Nations. 1982. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, *United Nations Treaty Series [UNTS]*, vol. 31363, p. 1833.

ANNEX II:

Expert Working Meeting, 29-30 October 2015: agenda and participants

AGENDA WORLD HERITAGE HIGH SEAS EXPERT MEETING

UNESCO HQ, Paris, 29-30 October 2015
Meeting room 4.021 (main building)

Purpose: Development of an assessment of the potential to apply the concept of Outstanding Universal Value to areas beyond national jurisdiction

Thursday 29 October : Day 1

8.30 – 9.00	Arrival of participants Map to venue – 7 Place Fontenoy, 75007 Paris, France
9.00 – 9.30	General Introduction: Development of an assessment of the potential to apply the concept of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) to areas beyond national jurisdiction: – Scope of the project – Objectives of the meeting – Expected outcomes and results <i>Dr. Fanny Douvère, Coordinator, Marine Programme, World Heritage Centre, UNESCO</i>
9.30 – 9.45	Message from the Partner <i>Mr. Philip Renaud, CEO Khaled bin Sultan Living Oceans Foundation</i>
9.45 – 10.15	Understanding Outstanding Universal Value: Nomination, inscription and evaluation of sites on the UNESCO World Heritage List What is OUV ? Example : Assessing Marine World Heritage from an Ecosystem Perspective: The Western Indian Ocean Comparative analysis <i>Dr. David Obura, Director CORDIO East Africa</i>
10.15 – 10.30	Presentation of the preliminary baseline assessment: Outstanding Universal Value in areas beyond national jurisdiction <i>Dr David Freestone, Lead Consultant, World Heritage High Seas project</i> <i>Dr. Dan Laffoley, IUCN Vice-Chair Marine, World Commission on Protected Areas</i>
10.30 – 10.45	Coffee break
10.45 – 12.45	PART I: SELECT POSSIBLE WORLD HERITAGE SITES IN AREAS BEYOND NATIONAL JURISDICTION Parameters for site selection and outcomes: preliminary baseline assessment <i>Moderator: Dr. Dan Laffoley, IUCN Vice-Chair Marine, World Commission on Protected Areas</i>
12.45 – 14.00	Lunch
14.00 – 15.30	Discussion Part I (continued)
15.30 – 16.00	Coffee break
16.00 – 17.45	DISCUSSION PART I (CONTINUED)
17.45 – 18.00	Wrap up Day 1 + introduction Day 2 <i>Dr Fanny Douvère, Coordinator, Marine Programme, World Heritage Centre, UNESCO</i>
20.00	Dinner



Impressions from the Expert Working Meeting.
© UNESCO / Actua

Friday 30 October : Day 2

- 9.00 - 10.30 **PART II: POSSIBLE LEGAL AND POLICY MECHANISMS FOR APPLICATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION IN HIGH SEAS**
Possible alternative policy/legal mechanism for application of the 1972 World Heritage Convention to areas beyond national jurisdiction and discussion
Moderator: Dr. David Freestone, Lead Consultant World Heritage High Seas project
- 10.30 – 10.45 Coffee Break
- 10.45 – 12.45 Discussion Part II (continued)
- 12.45 – 13.00 Lunch
- 13.00 – 15.30 **PART II: (CONCLUDING SESSION)**
Selection of core group of possible World Heritage sites in areas beyond national jurisdiction
Moderator: Dr. Dan Laffoley, IUCN Vice-Chair Marine, World Commission on Protected Areas
- 15.30 – 16.00 Coffee break
- 16.00 – 17.00 **Consolidation of action needed on draft materials and next steps**
Lead: Dr. David Freestone and Dr. Dan Laffoley
- 17.00 – 17.30 **Concluding remarks and closing of the meeting**
Dr. Fanny Douvère, Coordinator, Marine Programme, World Heritage Centre, UNESCO

Meeting Participants

Appeltans, Ward

UNESCO Intergovernmental
Oceanographic Commission/ IODE
Ostend, Belgium
w.appeltans@unesco.org

Casier, Robbert

Associate Programme Specialist
World Heritage Marine Programme
UNESCO
Paris, France
r.casier@unesco.org

Douvere, Fanny

Coordinator
World Heritage Marine
Programme
UNESCO
Paris, France
f.douvere@unesco.org

Freestone, David

Lead Project Consultant/
Executive Secretary
Sargasso Sea Commission
Washington DC, USA
dfreestone@sargassoalliance.org

Gjerde, Kristina

Senior High Seas Advisor,
IUCN
Boston, USA
kristina.gjerde@eip.com.pl

Halpin, Patrick

Director
Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab
Duke University
Durham, USA
phalpin@duke.edu

Hazin, Carolina

Global policy coordinator
Birdlife
Cambridge, UK
carolina.hazin@birdlife.org

Johnson, David

Director
Seascope Consultants
Romsey, UK
david.johnson@seascopeconsultants.
co.uk

Laffoley, Dan

Vice-Chair Marine, World
Commission on Protected Areas
IUCN
London, UK
danlaffoley@btinternet.com

Obura, David

Director
CORDIO East Africa
Mombasa, Kenya
davidobura@gmail.com

Pignolet Tardan, Florence

Représentante de La Région Réunion
Gouvernement régional de La
Réunion
Ile de la Réunion, France
florence.pignolet@cr-reunion.fr

Roberts, Callum

Conservation Biologist
University of York
York, UK
callum.roberts@york.ac.uk

Rodriguez, Mariamalia

High Seas Coordinator
MarViva Foundation
San Jose, Costa Rica
mariamalia.rodriguez@marviva.net

Ross Salazar, Erick

Science officer
MarViva Foundation
San Jose, Costa Rica
Erick.ross@marviva.net

Van Dover, Cindy

Director
Duke University Marine Laboratory
Durham, USA
c.vandover@duke.edu

Warner, Robin

Professor
Australian National
Centre for Ocean
Resources and Security
Sydney, Australia
rwarner@uow.edu.au

ANNEX III

List of interviewees, contributors and reviewers

Bandarin, Francesco

Assistant Director-General
UNESCO
f.bandarin@unesco.org

Block, Barbara

Professor of Marine Science
Stanford University, USA
bblock@stanford.edu

Boccardi, Giovanni

Chief
UNESCO Emergency Preparedness and Response Unit
g.boccardi@unesco.org

Cleary, Jesse

Duke University, USA
Jesse.cleary@duke.edu

Dromgoole, Sarah

University of Nottingham, UK
sarah.dromgoole@nottingham.ac.uk

Francioni, Francesco

Former chair of the World Heritage Committee
francesco.francioni@eui.eu

Guerin, Ulrike

Secretariat of the 2001 Convention on the Protection of
the Underwater Cultural Heritage
u.guerin@unesco.org

Harrison, Autumn-Lynn

Research Ecologist
Smithsonian Institution, USA
HarrisonAL@si.edu

Hladik, Jan

Chief
UNESCO Cultural Heritage Protection Treaties Section
j.hladik@unesco.org

Iza, Alejandro

Head
IUCN Environmental Law Programme
Alejandro.Iza@iucn.org

King, Joseph

Director
ICCROM Sites Unit
jk@iccrom.org

Lefebvre, Christophe

Délégué aux affaires internationales
Agence des aires marines protégées
Brest, France
christophe.lefebvre@aires-marines.fr

Oral, Nilufer

Faculty of Law, Istanbul Bilgi University, Turkey
IUCN Academy of Environmental Law
noral@bilgi.edu.tr

Rochette, Julien

Coordinator
Oceans and Coastal Zones Programme
Institute for Sustainable Development
and International Relations
Paris, France
julien.rochette@iddri.org

Rogers, Alex

Professor of Conservation Biology
University of Oxford, UK
alex.rogers@zoo.ox.ac.uk

Varmer, Ole

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Washington DC, USA
ole.Varmer@noaa.gov

Published within the World Heritage Series

World Heritage manuals

1

**Managing Tourism at World Heritage Sites:
a Practical Manual for World Heritage Site Managers**
**Gestión del turismo en sitios del Patrimonio Mundial:
Manual práctico para administradores de sitios del Patrimonio Mundial**
(In English) November 2002; (In Spanish) May 2005

World Heritage papers

2

Investing in World Heritage: Past Achievements, Future Ambitions
(In English) December 2002

World Heritage papers

3

Periodic Report Africa
Rapport périodique pour l'Afrique
(In English and French) April 2003

World Heritage papers

4

**Proceedings of the World Heritage Marine Biodiversity Workshop,
Hanoi, Viet Nam. February 25–March 1, 2002**
(In English) May 2003

World Heritage papers

5

Identification and Documentation of Modern Heritage
(In English with two papers in French) June 2003

World Heritage papers

6

World Heritage Cultural Landscapes 1992-2002
(In English) July 2004

World Heritage papers

7

Cultural Landscapes: the Challenges of Conservation
Proceedings from the Ferrara workshop, November 2002
(In English with conclusions and recommendations in French) August 2004

World Heritage papers

8

Mobilizing Young People for World Heritage
Proceedings from the Treviso workshop, November 2002
Mobiliser les jeunes pour le patrimoine mondial
Rapport de l'atelier de Trévis, novembre 2002
(In English and French) September 2003

World Heritage papers

9

**Partnerships for World Heritage Cities – Culture as a Vector for Sustainable Urban
Development. Proceedings from the Urbino workshop, November 2002**
(In English and French) August 2004

-
- World Heritage **papers 10** **Monitoring World Heritage
proceedings from the Vicenza workshop, November 2002**
(In English) September 2004
-
- World Heritage **papers 11** **Periodic Report and Regional Programme – Arab States 2000–2003**
Rapports périodiques et programme régional – Etats Arabes 2000–2003
(In English) September 2004
-
- World Heritage **papers 12** **The State of World Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region 2003**
L'état du patrimoine mondial dans la région Asie-Pacifique 2003
(In English) October 2004; (In French) July 2005
-
- World Heritage **papers 13** **Linking Universal and Local Values:
Managing a Sustainable Future for World Heritage**
**L'union des valeurs universelles et locales :
La gestion d'un avenir durable pour le patrimoine mondial**
(In English with the introduction, four papers and the conclusions and recommendations in French)
October 2004
-
- World Heritage **papers 14** **Archéologie de la Caraïbe et Convention du patrimoine mondial**
Caribbean Archaeology and World Heritage Convention
Arqueología del Caribe y Convención del Patrimonio Mundial
(In French, English and Spanish) July 2005
-
- World Heritage **papers 15** **Caribbean Wooden Treasures**
**Proceedings of the Thematic Expert Meeting on
Wooden Urban Heritage in the Caribbean Region
4–7 February 2003, Georgetown – Guyana**
(In English) October 2005
-
- World Heritage **papers 16** **World Heritage at the Vth IUCN World Parks Congress
Durban (South Africa), 8–17 September 2003**
(In English) December 2005
-
- World Heritage **papers 17** **Promouvoir et préserver le patrimoine congolais**
Lier diversité biologique et culturelle
Promoting and Preserving Congolese Heritage
Linking biological and cultural diversity
(In French and English) December 2005
-
- World Heritage **papers 18** **Periodic Report 2004 – Latin America and the Caribbean**
Rapport périodique 2004 – Amérique Latine et les Caraïbes
Informe Periodico 2004 – América Latina y el Caribe
(In English, French and Spanish) March 2006
-
- World Heritage **papers 19** **Fortificaciones Americanas y la Convención del Patrimonio Mundial**
American Fortifications and the World Heritage Convention
(In Spanish with the foreword, editorial, programme, opening ceremony and seven papers in English)
December 2006
-
- World Heritage **papers 20** **Periodic Report and Action Plan – Europe 2005-2006**
Rapport périodique et plan d'action – Europe 2005-2006
(In English and French) January 2007
-

-
- World Heritage papers **21** **World Heritage Forests**
Leveraging Conservation at the Landscape Level
(In English) May 2007
-
- World Heritage papers **22** **Climate Change and World Heritage**
Report on predicting and managing the impacts of climate change on World Heritage and Strategy to assist States Parties to implement appropriate management responses
Changement climatique et patrimoine mondial
Rapport sur la prévision et la gestion des effets du changement climatique sur le patrimoine mondial et Stratégie pour aider les États parties à mettre en oeuvre des réactions de gestion adaptées
(In English and French) May 2007
-
- World Heritage papers **23** **Enhancing our Heritage Toolkit**
Assessing management effectiveness of natural World Heritage sites
(In English) May 2008
-
- World Heritage papers **24** **L'art rupestre dans les Caraïbes**
Vers une inscription transnationale en série sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial de l'UNESCO
Rock Art in the Caribbean
Towards a serial transnational nomination to the UNESCO World Heritage List
Arte Rupestre en el Caribe
Hacia una nominación transnacional seriada a la Lista del Patrimonio Mundial de la UNESCO
(In French, English and Spanish) June 2008
-
- World Heritage papers **25** **World Heritage and Buffer Zones**
Patrimoine mondial et zones tampons
(In English and French) April 2009
-
- World Heritage papers **26** **World Heritage Cultural Landscapes**
A Handbook for Conservation and Management
(In English) December 2009
-
- World Heritage papers **27** **Managing Historic Cities**
Gérer les villes historiques
(In English) December 2009
-
- World Heritage papers **28** **Navigating the Future of Marine World Heritage**
Results from the first World Heritage Marine Site Managers Meeting Honolulu, Hawaii, 1–3 December 2010
Navegando el Futuro del Patrimonio Mundial Marino
Resultados de la primera reunión de administradores de sitios marinos del Patrimonio Mundial, Honolulu (Hawaii), 1–3 de diciembre de 2010
Cap sur le futur du patrimoine mondial marin
Résultats de la première réunion des gestionnaires des sites marins du patrimoine mondial, Honolulu (Hawaii), 1^{er}–3 décembre 2010
(In English) May 2011; (In Spanish) December 2011; (In French) March 2012
-
- World Heritage papers **29** **Human Evolution: Adaptations, Dispersals and Social Developments (HEADS)**
World Heritage Thematic Programme
Evolución Humana: Adaptaciones, Migraciones y Desarrollos Sociales
Programa Temático de Patrimonio Mundial
(In English and Spanish) June 2011
-

-
- World Heritage **papers** **30** **Adapting to Change**
The State of Conservation of World Heritage Forests in 2011
(In English) October 2011
-
- World Heritage **papers** **31** **Community development through World Heritage**
(In English) May 2012
-
- World Heritage **papers** **32** **Assessing Marine World Heritage from an Ecosystem Perspective:**
the Western Indian Ocean
(In English) June 2012
-
- World Heritage **papers** **33** **Human Origin Sites and the World Heritage Convention in Africa**
(In English) August 2012
-
- World Heritage **papers** **34** **World Heritage in a Sea of Islands Pacific 2009 Programme**
(In English) August 2012
-
- World Heritage **papers** **35** **Understanding World Heritage in Asia and the Pacific**
The Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting 2010-2012
(In English) November 2012
-
- World Heritage **papers** **36** **Earthen architecture in today's world**
Proceedings of the UNESCO International Colloquium on the Conservation
of World Heritage Earthen Architecture/ 17 – 18 December 2012
(In English and French) January 2014
-
- World Heritage **papers** **37** **Climate Change Adaptation for Natural World Heritage Sites**
A Practical Guide
(In English) May 2014
-
- World Heritage **papers** **38** **Safeguarding Precious Resources for Island Communities**
(In English) August 2014
-
- World Heritage **papers** **39** **Human origin sites and the World Heritage Convention in Asia**
(In English) October 2014
-
- World Heritage **papers** **40** **Engaging Local Communities in Stewardship of World Heritage**
(In English) November 2014
-
- World Heritage **papers** **41** **Human Origin Sites and the World Heritage Convention in Eurasia**
(In English) September 2015
-
- World Heritage **papers** **42** **Human Origin Sites and the World Heritage Convention in the Americas**
(In English and Spanish) April 2016
-
- World Heritage **reports** **43** **Understanding World Heritage in Europe and North America**
Final Report on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting 2012-2015
(In English and French) May 2016
-

PART V: APPENDICES



Austinograea spp. crab (center), deep-sea anemone (center), Alvinocarididae shrimp (left), and *Ifremeria nautilei* snails (right) on Bathymodiolid mussels (in diffuse hydrothermal venting, at the Kilo Moana vent field).
Image courtesy of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute and Charles Fisher, Pennsylvania State University.

Appendix 1:

The Lost City Hydrothermal Field

Illustration of potential Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas

Name of area:

The Lost City Hydrothermal Field

Location:

Mid-Atlantic Ridge, 30°07' N 42°07' W (750-900 m)

Description

The Lost City Hydrothermal Field is unlike any other ecosystem yet known on Earth. It is a remarkable geobiological feature in the deep sea (700-800 m water depth), meaning that it was formed by a combination of geological and biological forces. The site is dominated by the *Poseidon* carbonate monolith, a 60-m tall edifice made of carbonate, the raw material of chalk and limestone. It was discovered serendipitously in 2000 during an *Alvin* submarine dive on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge range of underwater mountains, and it is still being explored. The Lost City Hydrothermal Field is an area of active hot spring venting that extends for more than 300 m along an east-west trending geological fault. Serpentinite cliffs here 'weep' hot fluids, producing delicate finger-like outgrowths and multi-pinnacle chimneys. Recent radioisotope dating reveals that fluid venting at the Lost City has been ongoing for 120,000 years. The Lost City is located on the *Atlantis Massif*, a broad dome-like feature of 1.5-million-year-old crust at the intersection of the Mid-Atlantic Ridge and the Atlantis Fracture Zone.¹

In typical hydrothermal vents, or deep sea hot springs, of the mid-ocean ridge, venting fluids are heated by magma when seawater passes through cracks in hot crustal rock. In the Lost City, the fluid chemistry of vents seems to reflect lower-temperature (<150 °C) weathering of ultramafic (upper mantle) rock (peridotite) exposed to seawater. This weathering process, known as serpentinization from the peridotite weathering to serpentinite, produces heat, hydrogen (H₂) and methane (CH₄) as reaction products.

The highest temperature of venting fluids at the *Lost City* so far observed is in the order of 90° C and the fluid itself is calcium-rich and alkaline (pH 10 to 11), with very low metal concentrations. This system has been suggested as one of the chemical precursors for the origin of life, attracting the interest of NASA as a means of identifying the chemical signatures of life on other planets and moons.

The species that inhabit the Lost City Hydrothermal Field – both microorganisms and macrofauna – are different from those found at typical sulphide-rich hydrothermal vents on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge. Instead of dense swarms of shrimp or beds of mussels and clams that rely primarily on chemosynthesis for energy (from symbiotic, sulphide-oxidizing, chemoautotrophic microorganisms as are known for vent sites on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge), the Lost City invertebrate fauna, while relatively diverse, is visually understated as it has a very low biomass. But it is taxonomically distinct, presumably due to the unusual nature of the venting fluid at Lost City (high pH, low sulphide, high H₂ and CH₄). As a consequence, though poorly studied at present, the endemic invertebrate macrofauna that do exist at the Lost City (including gastropod snails, bivalves amphipods, stomatopods) are likely to exhibit unusual biochemical and physiological adaptations that have not yet been described in nature.

The microbial communities of the Lost City Hydrothermal Field are of particular interest because of the high concentrations of hydrogen and methane. Microbial densities are high, with up to 100 million cells in a gram of wet rock habitat in samples taken from actively venting carbonates. A particularly ancient type of microbe (archaeal phylotype) forms thick biofilms in the higher-temperature areas and is implicated in both methane generation and consumption. Bacteria, including sulphide oxidizers, are also found at the Lost City.

Jurisdiction – The Lost City Hydrothermal Field lies entirely in the High Seas.

Competent Authorities – includes the International Seabed Authority (ISA). For ongoing scientific evaluation and study: the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the National Science Foundation (NSF), the Natural

¹ this is not to be confused with the Atlantis Bank, in the south-west Indian Ocean

Environment Research Council (NERC), the Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS), among others.

Potential Outstanding Universal Value

Criterion vii – Superlative natural phenomena or natural beauty and aesthetic importance

While other sites in the world ocean with subsets of related geological features and processes are known to exist, the Lost City is globally singular among all known hydrothermal sites in the eerily lovely sculpture of its carbonate precipitates, its fluid chemistry and associated microbial and invertebrate community, and its longevity. Its magnificent shimmering carbonate edifices are reminiscent of Greek and Roman columns.

Criterion viii – Major stages in Earth's history and geological processes

The Lost City Hydrothermal Field is an extraordinary deep-sea site of significant, active (ongoing) serpentinization and hydrogen-, methane-, calcium-rich and alkaline fluid venting. The ultramafic nature of the system is chemically allied to lavas erupted into Earth's primordial ocean. Discoveries made at this site have fundamentally expanded our understanding of the diversity of hydrothermal processes on Earth. A comprehensive study of the structural and biochemical fossils harboured within the 120,000-year-old deposits remains to be undertaken.

Criterion ix – Significant ecological and biological processes in the evolution of ecosystems, communities of plant and animals

The Lost City Hydrothermal Field is postulated as a contemporary analogue for conditions where life on early Earth may have originated and for conditions that might support life within the oceans of extraterrestrial planetary bodies. The site is a locus for scientific study of prebiotic organic compounds such as formate and other low molecular weight organic acids produced by Fischer-Tropsch-type (FTT) reactions. These organic acids may have been critical building blocks for initiating life. Prebiotic compounds have since been studied in other serpentinite systems (e.g. the *Von Damm* site on the Cayman Rise), but *The Lost City* is the standard against which these other systems are compared.

Criterion x – Significant biological diversity and threatened species of OUV

Many of the taxa of the Lost City Hydrothermal Field – microbial and invertebrate – are so far known only from this site and represent 'living libraries', with biochemical and physiological adaptations to their extreme environment yet to be understood.

Threats

The Lost City Hydrothermal Field is located off-axis of the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, which is a ridge axis that hosts metal-rich hydrothermal vent areas licensed for mineral exploration by the International Seabed Authority; the main threat would be from indirect impact from deep-sea mining for minerals. The rugged seabed topography in the region is such that fishing is unlikely to be an issue.

Protection and management

Deep-sea mining is licensed by the International Seabed Authority (ISA). The site would qualify as a Vulnerable Marine Ecosystem (VME) under the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) criteria and be subject to management by a Regional Marine Fisheries Organization (RMFO).

Public awareness

The discovery of the Lost City Hydrothermal Field was covered by a variety of media outlets, including *Scientific American* (13 December, 2000) and the *New York Times* (14 August, 2001). The *Lost City* was featured in James Cameron's *Aliens of the Deep: Voyages to the Strange World of the Deep Ocean* (Disney 3D IMAX and book, 2005)² and there are *Wikipedia* (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lost_City_Hydrothermal_Field) and *MicrobeWiki* (https://microbewiki.kenyon.edu/index.php/Lost_City_Hydrothermal_Field) pages devoted to the site. Youtube includes short video documentaries of the Lost City Hydrothermal Field, including one narrated by Dr Robert Ballard (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F7wnrE3_i8A) and a brief 'flyover' (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5lv_HOTvuBQ). The NOAA *Ocean Explorer* programme featured a public 'telepresence' expedition to the Lost City Hydrothermal Field in 2005 (<http://oceanexplorer.noaa.gov/explorations/05lostcity/welcome.html>).

Geographic scale and site integrity

The Lost City Hydrothermal Field extends for at least 400 m across the terrace on top of the Atlantis Massif and is bound to the north by a small basin nicknamed Chaff Beach, and to the south by the Atlantis Transform Fault. A 20-km-wide buffer zone around the Lost City Hydrothermal Field would safeguard the integrity of this site.

² Cameron, J. (Producer) and Cameron, J. (Director). 2005. *Aliens of the Deep* [Motion Picture]. United States: Walt Disney Pictures
Macinnis, J., Macinnis, J., Macinnis, J.B., Thomas, L. (Editor), Cameron, J. (Introduction). *James Cameron's Aliens of the Deep: Voyages to the Strange World of the Deep Ocean*. 2005. National Geographic

Other comparable sites

A number of hydrothermal vents occur north and south of the Lost City Hydrothermal Field (see <http://vents-data.interridge.org/ventfields-geofield-map>), but none are of the same geological, geochemical or biological type as the Lost City.

References

- Allen, D. E. and Seyfried, W. E. 2004. Serpentinization and heat generation: constraints from Lost City and Rainbow hydrothermal systems. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 68, No. 6, pp. 1347-54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2003.09.003>
- Boetius, A. 2005. Lost city life. *Science*, Vol. 307, No. 5714, pp. 1420-22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1109849>
- Bradley, A. S., Hayes, J. M. and Summons, R. E. 2009. Extraordinary 13 C enrichment of diether lipids at the Lost City Hydrothermal Field indicates a carbon-limited ecosystem. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 73, No. 1, pp. 102-18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2008.10.005>
- Bradley, A. S., Fredricks, H., Hinrichs, K. U. and Summons, R. E. 2009. Structural diversity of diether lipids in carbonate chimneys at the Lost City Hydrothermal Field. *Organic Geochemistry*, Vol. 40, No. 12, pp. 1169-78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.orggeochem.2009.09.004>
- Bradley, A. S. and Summons, R. E. 2010. Multiple origins of methane at the Lost City Hydrothermal Field. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, Vol. 297, No. 1, pp. 34-41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2010.05.034>
- Brazelton, W. J., Schrenk, M. O., Kelley, D. S. and Baross, J. A. 2006. Methane-and sulfur-metabolizing microbial communities dominate the Lost City hydrothermal field ecosystem. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, Vol. 72, No. 9, pp. 6257-6270. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00574-06>
- DeChaine, E. G., Bates, A. E., Shank, T. M. and Cavanaugh, C. M. 2006. Off-axis symbiosis found: characterization and biogeography of bacterial symbionts of *Bathymodiolus* mussels from Lost City hydrothermal vents. *Environmental microbiology*, Vol. 8, No. 11, pp. 1902-12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2005.01113.x>
- Delacour, A., Früh-Green, G. L., Bernasconi, S. M., Schaeffer, P. and Kelley, D. S. 2008. Carbon geochemistry of serpentinites in the Lost City Hydrothermal System (30 N, MAR). *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 72, No. 15, pp. 3681-3702. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2008.04.039>
- Edwards, K. J., Bach, W. and McCollom, T. M. 2005. Geomicrobiology in oceanography: microbe-mineral interactions at and below the seafloor. *Trends in Microbiology*, Vol. 13, No. 9, pp. 449-56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2005.07.005>
- Foustoukos, D. I., Savov, I. P. and Janecky, D. R. 2008. Chemical and isotopic constraints on water/rock interactions at the Lost City hydrothermal field, 30 N Mid-Atlantic Ridge. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 72, No. 22, pp. 5457-74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2008.07.035>
- Früh-Green, G. L., Kelley, D. S., Bernasconi, S. M., Karson, J. A., Ludwig, K. A., Butterfield, D. A. and Proskurowski, G. 2003. 30,000 years of hydrothermal activity at the Lost City vent field. *Science*, Vol. 301, No. 5632, pp. 495-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1085582>
- Kelley, D. S., Karson, J. A., Blackman, D. K., Früh-Green, G. L., Butterfield, D. A., Lilley, M. D., ... and Rivizzigno, P. 2001. An off-axis hydrothermal vent field near the Mid-Atlantic Ridge at 30 N. *Nature*, Vol. 412, No. 6843, pp. 145-49. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/35084000>
- Kelley, D. S., Karson, J. A., Früh-Green, G. L., Yoerger, D. R., Shank, T. M., Butterfield, D. A. and Sylva, S. P. 2005. A serpentinite-hosted ecosystem: the Lost City hydrothermal field. *Science*, Vol. 307, No. 5714, pp. 1428-34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1102556>
- Kelley, D. S., Früh-Green, G. L., Karson, J. A. and Ludwig, K. A. 2007. *The Lost City Hydrothermal Field revisited*. *Oceanography*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 90-99.
- Konn, C., Charlou, J. L., Donval, J. P., Holm, N. G., Dehairs, F. and Bouillon, S. 2009. Hydrocarbons and oxidized organic compounds in hydrothermal fluids from Rainbow and Lost City ultramafic-hosted vents. *Chemical Geology*, Vol. 258, No. 3, pp. 299-314. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2008.10.034>
- Lang, S. Q., Butterfield, D. A., Schulte, M., Kelley, D. S. and Lilley, M. D. 2010. Elevated concentrations of formate, acetate and dissolved organic carbon found at the Lost City hydrothermal field. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 74, No. 3, pp. 941-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2009.10.045>
- LópezGarcía, P., Vereshchaka, A. and Moreira, D. 2007. Eukaryotic diversity associated with carbonates and fluid-seawater interface in Lost City hydrothermal field. *Environmental Microbiology*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 546-54.
- Lowell, R. P., and Rona, P. A. 2002. Seafloor hydrothermal systems driven by the serpentinization of peridotite. *Geophysical Research Letters*, Vol.

29, No. 11, pp. 26-1 – 26-4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2001GL014411>

- Ludwig, K. A., Kelley, D. S., Butterfield, D. A., Nelson, B. K. and Früh-Green, G. 2006. Formation and evolution of carbonate chimneys at the Lost City Hydrothermal Field. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 70, No. 14, pp. 3625-45. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2006.04.016>
- Ludwig, K. A., Shen, C. C., Kelley, D. S., Cheng, H. and Edwards, R. L. 2011. U–Th systematics and 230 Th ages of carbonate chimneys at the Lost City Hydrothermal Field. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 75, No. 7, pp. 1869-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2011.01.008>
- Martin, W. and Russell, M. J. 2007. On the origin of biochemistry at an alkaline hydrothermal vent. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 362, No. 1486, pp. 1887-1926. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2006.1881>
- Martin, W., Baross, J., Kelley, D. and Russell, M. J. 2008. Hydrothermal vents and the origin of life. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, Vol. 6, No. 11, pp. 805-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro1991>
- Proskurowski, G., Lilley, M. D., Kelley, D. S. and Olson, E. J. 2006. Low temperature volatile production at the Lost City Hydrothermal Field, evidence from a hydrogen stable isotope geothermometer. *Chemical Geology*, Vol. 229, No. 4, pp. 331-43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2005.11.005>
- Proskurowski, G., Lilley, M. D., Seewald, J. S., Früh-Green, G. L., Olson, E. J., Lupton, J. E. and Kelley, D. S. 2008. Abiogenic hydrocarbon production at Lost City hydrothermal field. *Science*, Vol. 319, No. 5863, pp. 604-07. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1151194>
- Schrenk, M. O., Kelley, D. S., Bolton, S. A. and Baross, J. A. 2004. Low archaeal diversity linked to subseafloor geochemical processes at the Lost City Hydrothermal Field, Mid-Atlantic Ridge. *Environmental Microbiology*, Vol. 6, No. 10, pp. 1086-95. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2004.00650.x>
- Von Damm, K. L. 2001. Lost city found. *Nature*, Vol. 412, No. 6843, pp. 127-28.
- Xie, W., Wang, F., Guo, L., Chen, Z., Sievert, S. M., Meng, J. and Xu, A. 2011. Comparative metagenomics of microbial communities inhabiting deep-sea hydrothermal vent chimneys with contrasting chemistries. *The ISME journal*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 414-26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2010.144>

Appendix 2

The Costa Rica Thermal Dome

Illustration of potential Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas

Name of area:**The Costa Rica Thermal Dome****Location:****Northeast Tropical Pacific - mean position near 9° N 90° W**

Description:

The Costa Rica Thermal Dome (CRTD) is an oceanic oasis in the Eastern Tropical Pacific whose high primary productivity attracts large ocean-going fish, marine mammals and marine mega-predators such as sharks, tuna, dolphins and whales. It is part of a migration corridor for critically endangered leatherback turtles. It is a highly productive thermal convection dome created through an interaction between wind and currents and covers a 300-500 km-wide area. It was first observed in 1948 (Wyrski, 1964) and described by Cromwell (1958). Although mobile, as most oceanographic features are, its location and presence off the coast of Costa Rica and Central America is reliable and predictable.

Winds blowing through the gaps in the Central American mountain range, as well as ocean currents, push the warm water aside to allow for the rising of nutrient-rich cold water which is 0.5° C lower than the surrounding water (Hofmann et al., 1981; Fiedler, 2002; Xie et al., 2005; Ballesteros, 2006). These colder surface waters are higher in nitrate and chlorophyll than surrounding areas, resulting in high levels of primary production (Broenkow, 1965; Chavez and Barber, 1987; Fiedler, 2002; Vilchis et al., 2006). The boundary between the warm surface water and cold deep water (called a thermocline) forms a dome-like feature, giving the area its name (Hofmann et al., 1981; Xie et al., 2005; Ballesteros, 2006; Kahru et al., 2007). The Dome is located about 300 km off the Gulf of Papagayo, Costa Rica and at its maximum extent is about 30% in jurisdictional waters, and 70% in the High Seas. It is one of only six biodiversity-rich domes of this kind in the world, but the CRTD is unique because it is formed by a coastal wind jet.

The high productivity of the CRTD provides an outstanding year-round habitat for the endangered blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*), for mating, breeding, calving and raising calves (Mate et al., 1999; Hoyt, 2009; Hoyt and Tetley, 2011). It is the only known thermocline dome in the world where blue whales feed and breed. Blue whales migrate south from Baja California during the winter for breeding, calving, raising young and feeding. The blue whale is classified as an Endangered species on the IUCN Red List, but may in fact meet the criterion for Critically Endangered (Reilly et al., 2008). The Eastern North Pacific blue whale population, at approximately 3,000 individuals, represents the largest remaining blue whale population on Earth (Calambokidis and Barlow, 2004). For a portion of this blue whale population, the Dome is an important habitat for the survival and recovery (Matteson, 2009) and forms a key component in a network of blue whale habitat sites, several of which have already been partially protected off the California coast and in the Gulf of California, off Mexico.

The CRTD is also important for the short-beaked common dolphin (*Delphinus delphis*) and other dolphins of the Eastern Tropical Pacific. It is of special relevance for several other emblematic marine vertebrates, such as the critically endangered Eastern Pacific population of the leatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*), which nests on the beaches of Costa Rica and migrates through the area, as well as many species of mobulid rays (genera *Manta* and *Mobula*). The seasonal winds that form the CRTD and the resulting coastal eddies help move leatherback hatchlings from the coast to offshore habitats (Shillinger et al., 2012).

Jurisdiction – The Costa Rica Thermal Dome lies mainly in the High Seas but 30% crosses into EEZs of Central American countries. The core area is fully in the High Seas.

Competent Authorities – In the High Seas, these include International Maritime Organization (IMO), Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), the International Whaling Commission (IWC), the International Seabed Authority (ISA), the Convention on Biological Diversity Ecologically or Biologically Significant Area process (CBD EBSA), the Central American Integration System with specific Agencies: Central American Commission on Environment and Development (CCAD), the Central American Isthmus

Fishing and Aquaculture Organization (OSPESCA), and the Central American Commission on Maritime Transportation (COCATRAM).

Potential Outstanding Universal Value

Criterion viii – Major stages in Earth’s history and geological processes

The Costa Rica Thermal Dome is an oceanographic feature in the Eastern Tropical Pacific formed by shoaling of the generally strong, shallow thermocline with upwelling of cool, nutrient-rich water, which promotes blooms of surface plankton. It differs from all other thermal domes elsewhere in the ocean by being a wind-driven (coastal jets) system. The upwelling at the Dome persists throughout the summer and early autumn, but diminishes by December-January.

Criterion ix – Significant ecological and biological processes in the evolution of ecosystems, communities of plant and animals

The upwelling of deep, nutrient-rich water at the Costa Rica Thermal Dome results in an area of high primary production detectable by remote sensing, forming a distinct biological habitat. The Dome’s area is heavily used by highly migratory marine predators such as tuna, billfish, sharks, manta rays, dolphins and whales, in particular endangered blue whales. It is also part of the migratory corridor of a population of endangered leatherback turtles nesting in Costa Rica. The area is of vital importance for blue whales as habitat for feeding, breeding, calving and raising young. All life stages of blue whale can be found here. In addition, a population of blue whales moves seasonally between the Thermal Dome and Baja California. Leatherback turtles migrate through the dome and the region may be critical habitat for their newly-hatched offspring.

Criterion x – Significant biological diversity and threatened species of OUV

The Thermal Dome area in the Eastern Tropical Pacific provides an area for blue whale feeding, mating, breeding, calving and raising calves. The blue whale is classified as an Endangered species on the IUCN Red List, but may in fact meet the criterion for Critically Endangered. The Eastern North Pacific blue whale population, at approximately 3,000 individuals, represents the largest remaining blue whale population on Earth. The location is an EBSA and is being considered as an Important Marine Mammal Area (IMMA) by the IUCN Joint SSC-WCPA Task Force on Marine Mammal Protected Areas.

Threats

The highest threats to the Costa Rica Thermal Dome are shipping traffic (pollution, collision risk to cetaceans, noise), overfishing, IUU fishing, pollution from marine and land-based sources (agriculture, wastewater), and climate change (alteration of physical oceanographic processes, ocean acidification and modification in the distribution patterns of species) (Bailey et al., 2012; Rolland et al., 2012). The Costa Rica Thermal Dome ranks as an area of medium to high impact under a global analysis of human impacts on marine ecosystems (Halpern et al., 2008). There is concern that overfishing or other threats could cause the disappearance, displacement or marginalization of this population of blue whales currently known to be increasing (Hoyt, 2009).

The oceanographic feature itself may be impacted in the future by climate change, but is already impacted by El Niño events with an increment of 3° C to 4° C during the El Niño years compared with other years, and the inhibition of upwelling events (Alexander et al., 2012).

Protection and management

The Costa Rica Thermal Dome was described as an Ecologically or Biologically Significant Area (EBSA) in 2014. For the portion of the Dome within the jurisdictional waters of the Central American countries, the policy and regulatory framework from the Central American Integrated System and its Agencies on environment (CCAD), the Central American Isthmus Fishing and Aquaculture Organization (OSPESCA) and the Central American Commission on Maritime Transportation (COCATRAM) is applicable to address the conservation and sustainable use of the marine resources in the region.

Public awareness

Since 2012, the MarViva Foundation (<http://www.marviva.net/>) has led an international, participatory process to design and recommend a governance model for the High Seas portion of the CRTD. In partnership with Mission Blue, the Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative (GOBI), Marine Conservation Biology Institute, Whale & Dolphin Conservation, IUCN, and the support of the JM Kaplan Fund, MarViva initiated a multi-sectoral analysis of the legal, technical and scientific data describing the Costa Rica Dome and the human activities dependent on the area and its resources. Within this process, meetings with regional and international competent authorities, and presentations of the initiative in international fora, have led to the steady consolidation of the initiative.

In addition, the Costa Rica Thermal Dome was also identified as a High Seas Gem by the Marine Conservation Biology

Institute. In 2014, the declaration of the area as an EBSA by the CBD raised scientific and public awareness about the Dome's relevance as a critical habitat for multiple species.

Geographic scale and site integrity

The size and location of this area varies throughout the year but the mean position is near 9° N 90° W, between the westward North Equatorial Current and the Eastward North Equatorial Counter-current. The proposed boundary encapsulates the thermal dome, which is a distinct biological habitat 300–500 km across and provides the basis for securing its integrity.

Other comparable sites

Five other dome systems occur in the world's ocean, but the Costa Rica Thermal Dome is globally unique because it is also forced by a coastal wind jet (Fiedler, 2002). The CRTD creates a unique, highly productive area, making the oceanic habitat of the Eastern Tropical Pacific more heterogeneous and productive than other areas in the tropical ocean (Kessler 2006; Fiedler 2002; Ballestero and Coen, 2004; Vilchis et al., 2006).

References

- Alexander, M. A., Seo, H., Xie, S. P. and Scott, J. D. 2012. ENSO's Impact on the Gap Wind Regions of the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean. *Journal of Climate*, Vol. 25, No. 10, pp. 3549–65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00320.1>
- Bailey, H., Mate, B. R., Palacios, D. M., Irvine, L., Bograd, S. J. and Costa D. P. 2009. Behavioural estimation of blue whale movements in the Northeast Pacific from state-space model analysis of satellite tracks. *Endangered Species Research*. Vol. 10, pp. 93–106. http://www.who.edu/cms/files/BaileyPreprint_BlueWhale_57185.pdf
- Bailey, H., Benson, S. R., Shillinger, G. L., Bograd, S. J., Dutton P. H., Eckert S. A., Morreale S. J., Paladino F. V., Eguchi T., Foley, D. G., Block, B. A., Piedra, R., Hitipeuw, C., Tapilatu, R. F. and Spotila, J. R. 2012. Identification of distinct movement patterns in Pacific leatherback turtle populations influenced by ocean conditions. *Ecological Applications*, Vol. 22, pp. 735–47.
- Ballance, L. T., Pitman, R. L. and Fiedler, P. C. 2006. Oceanographic influences on seabirds and cetaceans of the eastern tropical Pacific: A review. *Progress in Oceanography*, Vol. 69, No. 2–4, pp. 360–90. doi:10.1016/j.pocean.2006.03.013. <https://swfsc.noaa.gov/uploadedFiles/Divisions/PRD/Programs/Ecology/Ballanceetal2006PiO.pdf>
- Ballestero, D. and Coen, E. 2004. Generation and propagation of anticyclonic rings in the Gulf of Papagayo, Costa Rica. *Int.J. Remote Sensing*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 1–8.
- Ballestero, D. 2006. El Domo Térmico de Costa Rica. Capítulo VI in *Ambientes marino costeros de Costa Rica*. Informe Técnico. Nielsen-Muñoz, Vanessa, Quesada-Alpizar, Marco A. eds. Comision Interdisciplinaria Marino Costera de la Zona Economica Exclusiva de Costa Rica, San José, C.R. http://www.mespinozamen.com/uploads/4/5/7/6/4576162/infome_tecnico_ambientes_marinos_cr-czee_2006.pdf
- Broenkow, W. W. 1965. The distribution of nutrients in the Costa Rica Dome in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. *Limnology and Oceanography*, Vol. 10, pp. 40–52. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.4319/lo.1965.10.1.0040/pdf>
- Calambokidis, J. and Barlow, J. 2004. Abundance of blue and humpback whales in the Eastern North Pacific estimated by capture-recapture and line-transect methods. *Marine Mammal Science*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 63–85. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usdeptcommercepub/246/>
- Chavez, F. P. and Barber, R. T. 1987. An estimate of new production in the equatorial Pacific. *Deep-sea research. Part A. Oceanographic research papers*, Vol. 34, No. 7, pp. 1229–43. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0198-0149\(87\)90073-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0198-0149(87)90073-2)
- Cromwell, T. 1958. Thermocline topography, horizontal currents and “ridging” in the eastern tropical Pacific. *Bulletin Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission* 111, pp. 135–64.
- Fiedler, P. C. 2002. The annual cycle and biological effects of the Costa Rica Dome. *Deep-Sea Research I: Oceanographic Research Papers*, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 321–38. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0637\(01\)00057-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0637(01)00057-7)
- Halpern, B. S., Walbridge, S., Selkoe, K. A., Kappel, C. V., Micheli, F., D'Agrosa, C., Bruno, J. F., Casey, K. S., Ebert, C., Fox, H. E., Fujita, R., Heinemann, D., Lenihan, H. S., Madin, E. M. P., Perry, M. T., Selig, E. R., Spalding, M., Steneck, R. and Watson, R. 2008. A global map of human impact on marine ecosystems. *Science*, Vol. 319, No. 5868, pp. 319, 948–52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1149345>
- Hofmann, E. E., Busalacchi, A. J. and O'Brien, J. J. 1981. Wind generation of the Costa Rica Dome. *Science*, Vol. 214, pp. 552–54.

- Hoyt, E. 2009 The Blue Whale, *Balaenoptera musculus*: An endangered species thriving on the Costa Rica Dome. An illustration submitted to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Available online at <http://www.cbd.int/cms/ui/forums/attachment.aspx?id=73..>
- Hoyt, E. and Tetley, M. 2011. The Costa Rica Dome: Building a case for place-based management of blue whales on the high seas. An abstract submitted to the 2nd International Conference on Marine Mammal Protected Areas, Martinique, 7-11 November 2011.
- Kahru, M., Fiedler, P. C., Gille, S. T. Manzano, M., and Mitchell, B. G. 2007. Sea level anomalies control phytoplankton biomass in the Costa Rica Dome area. *Geophysical Research Letters*, Vol. 34, No. 22, pp. 1-5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2007GL031631>
- Kessler, W. S. 2006. The circulation of the eastern tropical Pacific: A review. *Progress in Oceanography*, Vol. 69, pp. 181–217.
- Mate B. R., Lagerquist, B. A. and Calambokidis, J. 1999. Movements of North Pacific blue whales during the feeding season off Southern California and their Southern fall migration. *Marine Mammal Science*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 1246-57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.1999.tb00888.x>
- Matteson, R. S. 2009. The Costa Rica Dome: A Study of Physics, Zooplankton and Blue Whales. Thesis for a Master of Science Degree in Oceanography, submitted to Oregon State University, USA, October 22, 2009. https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1957/13984/MattesonRobynS2009_thesis.pdf?sequence=1
- McClain, C. R., Christian, J. R., Signorini, S. R., Lewis, M. R., Asanuma, I., Turk, D. and Dupouy-Douchement, C. 2002. Satellite ocean-color observations of the tropical Pacific Ocean. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, Vol. 49, No. 13-14, pp. 2533–60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.1999.tb00888.x>
- Lumpkin, R. and G. C. Johnson 2013. Global ocean surface velocities from drifters: Mean, variance, El Niño–Southern Oscillation response, and seasonal cycle, *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, Vol. 118, pp. 2992–3006, doi:10.1002/jgrc.20210. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jgrc.20210/abstract>
- Palacios, D. M., Bograd, S. J., Foley, D. G. and Schwing, F. B. 2006. Oceanographic characteristics of biological hot spots in the North Pacific: A remote sensing perspective. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, Vol. 53, No. 3-4, pp. 250-69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2006.03.004>
- Reilly, S.B., Bannister, J.L., Best, P.B., Brown, M., Brownell Jr., R.L., Butterworth, D.S., Clapham, P.J., Cooke, J., Donovan, G.P., Urbán, J. & Zerbini, A.N. 2008. Blue Whales on the Costa Rica Dome/ Erich Hoyt, Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society • 8 *Balaenoptera musculus*. In: IUCN 2009. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2009.1. <www.iucnredlist.org>. Downloaded on 24 August 2009.
- Rolland, R. M., Parks, S. E., Hunt, K. E., Castellote, M., Corkeron, P. J., Nowacek, D. P., Wasser, S. K. and Kraus, S.D. 2012. Evidence that ship noise increases stress in right whales. *Proc. R. Soc. B*, Vol. 276, No. 1737, pp. 1471-2954. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2011.2429>
- Saito, M. A., Rocap, G. and Moffett, J. W. 2005. Production of cobalt binding ligands in a *Synechococcus* feature at the Costa Rica upwelling dome. *Limnology and Oceanography*, Vol. 50, No. 1, pp. 279-90. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.4319/lo.2005.50.1.0279/pdf>
- Shillinger, G. L., Swithenbank, A. M., Bailey, H., Bograd, S. J., Castelton, M. R., Wallace, B. P., Spotila, J. R., Paladino, F. V., Piedra, R. and Block, B. A. 2011. Vertical and horizontal habitat preferences of post-nesting leatherback turtles in the South Pacific Ocean. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, Vol. 422, pp. 275-89. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps08884>
- Shillinger, G. L., Di Lorenzo, E., Luo, H., Bograd, S. J., Hazen, E. L., Bailey, H. and Spotila, J. R. 2012. On the dispersal of leatherback turtle hatchlings from Meso-American nesting beaches. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, Vol. 279, pp. 2391-95.
- Tetley, M. J. and Hoyt, E. 2012. A Big Blue network: building a case for place-based management of blue whales on the high seas. Abstract, European Cetacean Society, 26th Annual Conference ECS, Galway, Ireland, p. 217.
- Vilchis, L. I., Ballance, L. T. and Fiedler, P. C. 2006. Pelagic habitat of seabirds in the eastern tropical Pacific: effects of foraging ecology on habitat selection. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, Vol. 315, pp. 279-92. <https://swfsc.noaa.gov/uploadedFiles/Divisions/PRD/Programs/Ecology/Vilchisetal2006MEPS.pdf>
- Wyrteki, K. 1964. Upwelling in the Costa Rica Dome. *Fishery Bulletin*, Vol. 63, No. 2, pp. 355–72. <http://fishbull.noaa.gov/63-2/wyrteki.pdf>
- Xie, S. -P., Xu, H., Kessler, W. S. and Nonaka, M. 2005. Air–Sea Interaction over the Eastern Pacific Warm Pool: Gap Winds, thermocline Dome, and Atmospheric Convection. *J. Climate*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 5–20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-3249.1>

Appendix 3:

The White Shark Café

Illustration of potential Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas

Name of area:

The White Shark Café

Location:

Eastern Tropical Pacific - approximately 23°22' N 132°42' W

Description:

Approximately halfway between North America and Hawaii, in the blank emptiness of the eastern Pacific, there is a place that to a human observer looks featureless and unremarkable. There are no landmarks here, no coasts to interrupt the endless cobalt blue. But this place is very special indeed to one of the ocean's largest hunters, the great white shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*). At one time, these sharks were known only in the eastern Pacific from their coastal haunts in California and Mexico where they appeared seasonally to hunt breeding elephant seals and sea lions. Satellite tracking tags have now revealed that after the coastal foraging bonanza, they migrate far offshore, congregating in this remote spot, probably to feed and mate. Researchers call it the White Shark Café. No other place like it is known anywhere else in the world.

White sharks are protected internationally under CITES (Appendix II) and are listed as Vulnerable under the IUCN Red List. The White Shark Café was completely unknown until animal borne tags, called pop-up satellite archival tags, were attached to sharks to track their movements, behaviours and the environmental conditions experienced (Weng et al. 2007, Domeier and Nasby-Lucas, 2008, Jorgensen et al. 2010). The tags record depth, temperature and light providing robust information on position and use of the open seas. In the past decade, over 100 white sharks have been satellite tagged in north-eastern Pacific waters, completely transforming our understanding both of the sharks and the High Seas environment they inhabit. Satellite tag data indicate that sub-adult and adult white sharks seasonally congregate in a distinct area of the warmer

offshore waters of the subtropical gyre (a huge rotating current), called the White Shark Café, and later on return to the California Current where coastal feeding aggregations occur around elephant seal and sea lion rookeries in Central California and Guadalupe Island, Mexico (Boustany et al., 2002; Weng et al., 2007; Domeier and Nasby-Lucas, 2008; Jorgensen et al., 2012; Carlisle et al., 2012). Domeier and Nasby Lucas (2008) demonstrated that white sharks tagged off Guadalupe Island, Mexico also visited the same offshore locations, indicating that the two groups of sharks from North America overlap seasonally.

Electronic tagging data have shown that in addition to white sharks, other pelagic shark species including mako, salmon and blue sharks, tunas (albacore, bigeye and yellowfin tunas) and seabirds, also migrate to this distinct and enigmatic region of the subtropical gyre (Block et al., 2011). The satellite tagging data indicate that this is a seasonal aggregation site for the majority of the adult white shark population in the north-eastern Pacific. Jorgensen et al. (2012b) noted the Café was primarily defined by the presence of males converging during spring within a much smaller core area coincident with an increased rate of vertical diving movements, while females visited the Café centre only briefly. They suggested this region as a potential mating area although given the aggregation of many species in the region, foraging may also be on going here.

The extensive use by white sharks and other species underlines the great importance of the White Shark Café. Continued use of satellite tags has confirmed repeat visitation occurs annually.

Jurisdiction – The White Shark Café lies entirely in the High Seas.

Competent Authorities – include Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)

Potential Outstanding Universal Value

Criterion vii – Superlative natural phenomena or natural beauty and aesthetic importance

Coastal waters are important habitat for many marine species, including white sharks. In the past decade, it has become apparent that pelagic environments also support aggregations, and coastal species often utilize offshore habitat during some phase of their life cycle. The California Current flows north to south along the continental shelf, and is a highly productive upwelling region that is retentive to a large number of top predators (Block et al., 2011). Photo identification of white shark individuals and acoustic and satellite tagging has shown that white sharks occupy predictable sites in the California Current, off North America. Sharks usually forage around pinniped colonies for as much as six months of the year, from late August until early February. Sharks from both North American sites (Central California Islands and Guadalupe Island) have been observed with electronic tags to make seasonal migrations, remaining inshore in neritic waters foraging from late summer and autumn months to winter, and then travelling to the same general offshore aggregation area - the White Shark 'Café'. The white sharks remain offshore in the waters of the subtropical gyre (Café), with some individuals moving as far west as the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. White sharks return back to the North American foraging zones, often showing site fidelity to the original regions where they were tagged (Weng et al., 2007; Domeier and Nasby-Lucas, 2008; Jorgensen et al., 2012b).

Criterion ix – Significant ecological and biological processes in the evolution of ecosystems, communities of plant and animals

Genetic studies demonstrate that global white shark populations have discrete subpopulation structure with unique demographics in South Africa, Australia, the Northeast Pacific Ocean, the Northwest Atlantic and the Mediterranean Sea (Pardini et al., 2000; Gubili et al., 2010, 2012; Jorgensen et al., 2010; Tanaka et al., 2011). Electronic tagging has shown that Northeast Pacific Ocean white sharks have a broad distribution extending from the North American continent to the Hawaiian Islands. These tagging data suggest sub-adult and adult white sharks seasonally inhabit warmer offshore waters of the subtropical gyre (the White Shark Café), and return to the California Current where coastal feeding aggregations occur in Central California and Guadalupe Island, Mexico (Boustany et al., 2002; Weng et al., 2007; Jorgensen et al., 2010). The majority of white shark observations of the NEP sharks occur near the North American coastline, usually at coastal islands that serve as pinniped rookeries such as the Farallon Islands, Año Nuevo and Guadalupe Island. Here, long-term studies, including photo identification and electronic tagging, have enabled individual tracking for several years to periods over two decades. (Jorgensen et al., 2010; Anderson et al., 2011).

Criterion x – Significant biological diversity and threatened species of OUV

White sharks (*Carcharodon carcharias*) are top predators in coastal and open ocean ecosystems that occur circumglobally. White sharks have warm bodied, or endothermic physiology. They are long-lived, late to mature and produce few young, making them vulnerable to overexploitation (Cailliet et al., 1985; Chapple and Botsford, 2013). Other than in unique offshore locations such as the White Shark Café, white sharks are most frequently observed in inshore temperate continental shelf waters, where they often forage on pinniped colonies close to shore. White sharks typically take up to 100 days to arrive at the Café, travelling around 1 m/s, during which they make periodic dives as deep as 900 m. While at the Café, they dive to depths of 300 m as often as once every ten minutes. The purpose of the dives, either along the journey or in the Café area, is unknown. White sharks are protected internationally under CITES (Appendix II) and listed as Vulnerable under the IUCN Red List. In the Northeast Pacific Ocean, the unique population of white sharks are of significant conservation concern (Chapple and Botsford, 2013).

Threats

The main threat is fishing and, in particular, the international longline fleet that covers the international waters that include the White Shark Café.

Understanding the role that oceanic habitats play in the life histories of these pelagic sharks is also important for conservation and management purposes. North American West Coast sharks are most vulnerable to capture by unregulated international fisheries in the High Seas. Given the sensitivity of these species to overexploitation, a more comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing offshore migrations is required for their effective conservation and management. By identifying the underlying life history function of these migrations and understanding the roles that oceanography and biology play in influencing their patterns of habitat use, we can develop environmental models that help to identify how and why California Current sharks utilize offshore habitats, create predictive frameworks to model their distribution based on oceanographic conditions, and help lay the foundation for protection and effective management of these regions and ecosystems.

Protection and management

Tuna fisheries in the region of the Pacific in which the White Shark Café is located are managed by the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC).

During the coastal phase for many marine species, direct observation is possible, supporting extensive studies of the animals and systems and the development of management and protection regimes. However, when animals are in the offshore environment, direct observation becomes virtually impossible; as a result, we know very little about where, when or how pelagic environments are used by these animals. Consequently, very little protection is in place in pelagic zones. However, over the last several decades there has been rapid advancement in electronic tagging technologies, with tags becoming smaller, cheaper, more reliable and capable of collecting data on an increasing array of parameters. These advancements in tag technology have not only enabled description of the coastal aggregations and behaviours of many species, but have provided a whole new understanding of how pelagic predators utilize oceanic habitats. The unprecedented electronic tagging conducted by the Tagging of Pelagic Predators (Block et al., 2011), which encompassed 23 pelagic predators that as a group utilize the full extent of the North Pacific, identified a variety of important pelagic hotspots and migratory corridors that appear to be vital to the survival of many species.

The Café has been identified as a candidate Ecologically or Biologically Significant Area (EBSA).

Public awareness

Stanford University, Monterey Bay Aquarium and Marine Conservation Science Institute, Shark Stewards, Discovery, True Blue Films and the BBC have written science and public articles, created two films (for Shark Week, entitled 'Great White Highway' and 'Blue Sereneti') and presented the most concrete data that has established this region as a unique site worthy of protection.

Geographic scale and site integrity

The White Shark Café consists of a large and well-delineated oligotrophic area in the north east pacific sub-tropical gyre centered between the Baja peninsula and the big island of Hawaii. By using tagging data, it has been possible to delineate a predictable area critical for white sharks and as such this forms the basis for the integrity of the site proposed.

Other comparable sites

The White Shark Café forms one of several important pelagic hotspots and migratory corridors identified by Block et al. (2011), which also include the North Pacific Transition Zone, and Intertropical Convergence Zone, all of which attract and retain a variety of pelagic predators, but none in such

aggregations for the white shark as the Café. These have been likened to the 'watering holes' of the African savannah.

References

- Anderson, S. D., Chapple, T. K., Jorgensen, S. J., Klimley, A. P. and Block, B. A. 2011. Long-term individual identification and site fidelity of white sharks, *Carcharodon carcharias*, off California using dorsal fins. *Mar. Biol.* Vol. 158, pp. 1233–37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00227-011-1643-5>
- Block, B. A., Jonsen, I. D., Jorgensen, S. J., Winship, A. J., Shaffer, S. A., Bograd, S. J., Hazen, E. L., Foley, D. G., Breed, G. A., Harrison, A.-L., Ganong, J. E., Swithenbank, A., Castleton, M., Dewar, H., Mate, B. R., Shillinger, G. L., Schaefer, K. M., Benson, S. R., Weise, M. J., Henry, R. W. and Costa, D. P. 2011. Tracking apex marine predator movements in a dynamic ocean. *Nature*, Vol. 475, pp. 86–90. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature10082>
- Boustany, A. M., Davis, S. F., Pyle, P., Anderson, S. D., Boeuf, B. J. L. and Block, B. A. 2002. Satellite tagging: Expanded niche for white sharks. *Nature*, Vol. 415, pp. 35–36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/415035b>
- Cailliet, G. M., Natanson, L. J., Weldon, B. A. and Ebert, D. A. 1985. Preliminary studies on the age and growth of the white shark, *Carcharodon carcharias*, using vertebral bands. *Mem. South. Calif. Acad. Sci.* Vol. 9, pp. 49–60.
- Carlisle, A. B., Kim, S. L., Semmens, B. X., Madigan, D. J., Jorgensen, S. J., Perle, C. R., Anderson, S. D., Chapple, T. K., Kanive, P. E. and Block, B. A. 2012. Using Stable Isotope Analysis to Understand the Migration and Trophic Ecology of Northeastern Pacific White Sharks (*Carcharodon carcharias*). *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 7, e30492. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0030492>
- Chapple, T. K., Jorgensen, S. J., Anderson, S. D., Kanive, P. E., Klimley, A. P., Botsford, L. W. and Block, B. A. 2011. A first estimate of white shark, *Carcharodon carcharias*, abundance off Central California. *Biology Letters*, Vol. 7, pp. 581–83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2011.0124>
- Chapple, T. K. and Botsford, L. W. 2013. A comparison of linear demographic models and fraction of lifetime egg production for assessing sustainability in sharks. *Conserv. Biol.* Vol. 27, pp. 560–68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12053>
- Domeier, M. and Nasby-Lucas, N. 2008. Migration patterns of white sharks *Carcharodon carcharias* tagged at

- Guadalupe Island, Mexico, and identification of an eastern Pacific shared offshore foraging area. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, Vol. 370, pp. 221–37.
- Domeier, M., Nasby-Lucas, N. and Palacios, D. 2012. The Northeastern Pacific White Shark Shared Offshore Foraging Area (SOFA). *Global Perspectives on the Biology and Life History of the White Shark* pp. 147–58. CRC Press.
- Francis, M. P. 1996. Observations on a pregnant white shark with a review of reproductive biology. p. 157-72. In *Great White Sharks: the biology of Carcharodon carcharias*. Academic Press, Inc., New York.
- Gubili, C., Bilgin, R., Kalkan, E., Karhan, S. Ü., Jones, C. S., Sims, D. W. et al. 2010. Antipodean white sharks on a Mediterranean walkabout? Historical dispersal leads to genetic discontinuity and an endangered anomalous population. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* Vol. 278, No. 1712, pp.1679-86. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21084352>
- Gubili, C., Duffy, C. A. J., Cliff, G., Wintner, S. P., Shivji, M., Chapman, D. et al. 2012. Application of molecular genetics for conservation of the great White Shark, *Carcharodon carcharias*, L. 1758, in *Global Perspectives on the Biology and Life History of the White Shark* (CRC Press), pp. 357–80. <http://www.crcnetbase.com/doi/abs/10.1201/b11532-16>
- Jorgensen, S. J., Reeb, C. A., Chapple, T. K., Anderson, S., Perle, C., Sommeran, V. R. S. et al. 2010. Philopatry and migration of pacific white sharks. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* Vol. 277, pp. 679–88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2009.1155>
- Jorgensen, S. J., Arnoldi, N. S., Estess, E. E., Chapple, T. K., Rückert, M., Anderson, S. D. and Block, B. A. 2012a. Eating or Meeting? Cluster Analysis Reveals Intricacies of White Shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*) migration and offshore behavior, *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 7, e47819. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0047819>
- Jorgensen, S., Chapple, T., Hoyos, M., Reeb, C. and Block, B. 2012b. Connectivity among White Shark Coastal Aggregation Areas in the Northeastern Pacific. *Global Perspectives on the Biology and Life History of the White Shark*, pp. 159–68. CRC Press.
- Lumpkin, R. and Johnson, G. C. 2013. Global ocean surface velocities from drifters: Mean, variance, El Nino–Southern Oscillation response, and seasonal cycle, *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, Vol. 118, pp. 2992–3006, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jgrc.20210>
- Pardini, A. T., Jones, C. S., Noble, L. R., Kreiser, B., Malcolm, H., Bruce, B. D., Stevens, J. D., Cliff, G., Scholl, M. S., Francis, M., Duffy, C. A. J. and Martin A. P. 2001. Sex-biased dispersal of great white sharks. *Nature*, Vol. 412, pp.139-40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/35084125>
- Tanaka, S., Kitamura, T., Mochizuki, T. and Kofuji, K. 2011. Age, growth and genetic status of the white shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*) from Kashima-nada, Japan. *Mar. Freshw. Res.* Vol. 62, pp. 548–56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/MF10130>
- Teo, S., Boustany, A., Blackwell, S., Walli, A., Weng, K. and Block B. 2004. Validation of geolocation estimates based on light level and sea surface temperature from electronic tags. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* Vol. 283, pp. 81–98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3354/meps283081>
- Weng, K., Boustany, A., Pyle, P., Anderson, S., Brown, A. and Block, B. 2007. Migration and habitat of white sharks (*Carcharodon carcharias*) in the eastern Pacific Ocean. *Marine Biology*, Vol. 152, pp. 877–94.

Appendix 4:

The Sargasso Sea

Illustration of potential Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas

Name of area:

The Sargasso Sea

Location:

Wider Caribbean and western Mid-Atlantic. 30° N and 60° W.

Description

The 'Golden Floating Rainforest of the Ocean', the Sargasso Sea, is home to an iconic pelagic ecosystem built around the floating *Sargassum* seaweed, the world's only holopelagic algae. It was first viewed by Columbus on his first voyage in 1492 and has been a place of myth and legend ever since, it is located within the North Atlantic sub-tropical gyre bounded on all sides by the clockwise flow of major ocean currents. As such, it is the only sea without coasts, for only the islands of Bermuda lie within it. Its global importance derives from a combination of physical and oceanographic structure, its complex pelagic ecosystems and its role in global ocean and earth system processes (Freestone and Roe et al., 2015).

The floating *Sargassum* hosts a diverse community of associated organisms that include ten endemic species, and provides essential habitat for key life stages of a wide diversity of species, many of which are endangered or threatened or of economic worth. Young sea turtles spend their early – so called 'lost' - years in the *Sargassum* mats where they are protected and nurtured. The Sargasso Sea is the only breeding location for European and American eels, both endangered (the former critically), and is on the migration route of numerous other iconic and endangered species. A variety of oceanographic processes impact productivity and species diversity, and the area plays a disproportionately large role in global ocean processes of oxygen production and carbon sequestration.

The sea floor has two large seamount chains, home to specialized, fragile and endemic communities, and models predict the presence of numerous other isolated seamounts. Both pelagic and benthic ecosystems are impacted by a range of human activities, and the currents of the gyre act to concentrate pollutants.

The area has been of historic relevance and significance since the earliest days of ocean exploration and is the location of significant scientific discoveries that have expanded our understanding of how the global oceans function. Recent action to protect the Sargasso Sea and details of all aspects of an underlying comprehensive science case can be found in Laffoley and Roe et al. (2011).

Jurisdiction - The core area of the Sargasso Sea area featured here is in predominantly High Seas but also includes the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of Bermuda.

Competent Authorities – includes the International Seabed Authority (ISA), International Maritime Organization (IMO), Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO), and The International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT).

Potential Outstanding Universal Value

Criterion viii – Major stages in Earth's history and geological processes

The Sargasso Sea forms one of the world's five ocean gyres but is globally significant as the only one with a significant floating community based around *Sargassum* algae. It is surrounded by the Gulf Stream to the west, the North Atlantic Drift to the north, the more diffuse Canary Current to the east, and the North Equatorial Current and the Antilles Current to the south. Water retention within the Sargasso Sea is estimated to be up to 50 years and a variety of oceanographic features and processes influence the ecology and biology of the Sargasso Sea on different spatial and temporal scales. Cyclonic or anticyclonic rings and eddies spun off the Gulf Stream may persist as distinct entities for many months to years and these create localized

upwelling and downwelling which impact the upper layers of the Sargasso Sea by mixing surface and deeper waters. This affects nutrients, heat and salinity which together create localized areas of high or low productivity, which in turn impact biodiversity by ‘capturing’ and bringing ‘foreign species’ into the area, creating relic populations which may persist for months or, conversely, by spinning species out into the Gulf Stream. The Sargasso Sea plays a key role in both global oxygen production and ocean sequestration of carbon. It is one of the best-known areas of the world’s ocean, studied since the 1870s and home to Hydrostation S, the longest-running time series of oceanographic measurements, begun in 1954. Data from the Sargasso Sea have proved critical to our understanding of global ocean processes and global change. The discovery of *Prochlorococcus* and the development of techniques able to evaluate the role of picoplankton in primary production measurements revolutionized perceptions of productivity in the Sargasso Sea and subsequently of the global ocean.

Criterion ix – Significant ecological and biological processes in the evolution of ecosystems, communities of plant and animals

The Sargasso Sea is the ecological crossroads of the Atlantic Ocean. The two species of floating *Sargassum* found in the Sargasso Sea are the world’s only holopelagic macroalgae, distinct from all other complex seaweeds in not having an attached benthic stage. Although these species occur in the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean, the extent of their occurrence in the Sargasso Sea provides a unique and valuable structurally complex habitat in deep, open-ocean waters. The Sargasso Sea is home to numerous endemic species that are, by definition, rare. The floating *Sargassum* community hosts ten endemic species from a broad range of taxa. The mid-water fish community of the Sargasso Sea includes a suite of sub-tropical endemics from three genera in the family *Stomiidae*. On the sea floor, the New England seamount chain and the Corner Sea Rise seamounts are known to host endemic species and specialized communities, and models indicate that other isolated seamounts occur throughout the area.

Criterion x – Significant biological diversity and threatened species of OUV

Many of the species utilizing the Sargasso Sea are of global conservation significance, appearing on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, and/or under CITES, as well as in the annexes of the 1990 SPAW Protocol of the Cartagena Convention. Threatened and endangered species utilizing the Sargasso Sea include seabirds in the air above, turtles in the floating *Sargassum*, large pelagic fishes and cetaceans in the waters below, and a wide variety of deep water corals on seamounts rising from the seabed. It is the only spawning area for American and European eels, *Anguilla rostrata* and *Anguilla anguilla*. Porbeagle sharks (*Lamna nasus*) migrate from Canadian waters to the Sargasso Sea, where they may be pupping. The mats of *Sargassum* and their associated

communities are essential as nursery habitats and feeding areas for many species of fish, seabirds and turtles. These include *Sargassum*-endemic species, such as the *Sargassum* anglerfish (*Histrio histrio*) and pipefish (*Syngnathus pelagicus*), as well as oceanic flying fish (Exocoetidae), white marlin (*Tetrapturus albidus*) and blue marlin (*Makaira nigricans*). Nearly all the large tunas and tuna-like species managed by ICCAT, including the bluefin tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*), migrate through the Sargasso Sea, while Albacore tuna are also believed to spawn in the Sargasso Sea. Green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*), hawksbill turtles (*Eretmochelys imbricate*), loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*), and Kemp’s ridley turtles (*Lepidochelys kempii*), all of which are threatened or endangered, use *Sargassum* as a nursery habitat. Hatchlings swim hundreds of miles to the Sargasso Sea, where they hide in the *Sargassum* to feed and grow in relative safety, spending their so called ‘lost years’ among the weed. Below the floating *Sargassum*, the Corner Rise and New England Seamounts host abundant populations of deep-water fish and, despite heavy commercial exploitation, remain important as aggregating and spawning areas for the alfonsino (*Beryx splendens*). A variety of seabirds feed in association with *Sargassum* in the Sargasso Sea and its waters provide critical food and shelter for a variety of organisms on migratory routes between the tropical and temperate Atlantic, including basking sharks (*Cetorhinus maximus*), adult leatherback turtles (*Dermodochelys coriacea*) and humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*), during their annual migrations between the Caribbean and the northern North Atlantic.

Threats

Despite its remote location, the Sargasso Sea does not remain totally natural. A recent global analysis of human impacts of marine ecosystems concluded that the area has sustained moderate to high impacts over time. Fisheries landings for many species in the North Central Atlantic have declined significantly in the last 50 years, indicative of impacts on those populations. Bottom trawling between 1976 and 1995 on the Corner Rise seamounts caused extensive destruction of the benthic fauna. Floating plastic particles were reported in the Sargasso Sea as early as 1972, and today the currents of the North Atlantic gyre have trapped floating debris on a scale similar to the more infamous North Pacific garbage patch with concentrations of plastic particles reaching in excess of 100,000 pieces/km² in some places. This clearly impacts the naturalness of the area, and the negative impacts of plastic debris on organisms such as turtles and seabirds are well-documented.

There are also some 11 submarine communications cables that have a minor effect on the naturalness of the seabed, and this is likely to be an ongoing issue. The Sargasso Sea lies within one of the world’s busiest international shipping areas and is crossed by a large number of vessels each year. This affects the naturalness of the area, but impacts on

conditions are unclear as appropriate research is lacking. Areas of concern include the possible introduction of invasive species via ballast water, the potential impact of underwater noise generated by ships on marine mammals, and the risk of collision with whales, dolphins and turtles. Shipping transiting the Sargasso Sea may also have a direct physical impact on the *Sargassum* mats, destroying the integrity of the floating community. Research is clearly needed to quantify the degree of pressure that shipping exerts on the Sargasso Sea. Despite these concerns regarding the condition of the Sargasso Sea, the ecological and biological functionality of the ecosystem remain intact, allowing this unique area to still fulfil its role as a home and an essential resource for a great diversity of species, many of which are of considerable conservation interest.

Protection and management

In March 2014, representatives from 11 governments met in Bermuda to express concern for the conservation of the Sargasso Sea and five (Azores, Bermuda, Monaco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America) signed the *Hamilton Declaration on Collaboration for the Conservation of the Sargasso Sea* (Freestone and Morrison, 2014). Pursuant to the Declaration, Bermuda established the Sargasso Sea Commission (Freestone and Bulger, 2016) composed of scientists and others of international repute, serving in their personal capacity, to exercise a stewardship role and to assist the signatory governments in developing proposals for conservation measures to be presented to international and regional bodies with sectoral responsibilities for this High Seas area.

The Commission has sponsored the listing, proposed successfully by Monaco in 2014, of the European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) under Appendix II of the Convention on Migratory Species. It has engaged productively with the cable industry in discussion of best practices in the laying and maintenance of submarine communication cables through the Sargasso Sea (de Juvigny et al., 2015). It is also sponsoring scientific work through the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) aimed at regulatory actions by ICCAT. In September 2015, after proposals by the Hamilton Declaration, signatories to the North-west Atlantic Fisheries Organization banned the use of attachments to gear used in mid-water trawling that might impact the seabed and banned all fishing, including exploratory fishing on all the seamounts under the Sargasso Sea until the end of 2020. The recovery of these habitats in the coming years will be monitored.

Actions to address some of these concerns can only serve to improve the future outlook for the area. Concerns for the future include the potential for commercial extraction of *Sargassum* seaweed and seabed mining activities. Application of the precautionary approach is vital to ensure

the continued ecological and biological importance of this area into the future.

Public awareness

The Sargasso Sea was first reported by Christopher Columbus aboard the 'Santa Maria' on his first voyage in 1492. His sailors, afraid of becoming entangled in the weed and being dragged down to the ocean floor, started the first myths and legends. In the late 19th century, Jules Verne wrote in *Twenty Thousand Leagues under the Sea* (Verne and Miller, 1966) 'Captain Nemo, not wishing to entangle his crew in this herbaceous mass, kept some yards beneath the surface of the waves'. Further notoriety followed by association with the infamous Bermuda Triangle, the south-west area of the Sargasso Sea between Bermuda, Florida and Puerto Rico, where planes and ships apparently suddenly disappeared for no obvious reason. Disney somewhat redressed these fears with his adventures of Donald Duck in the *Secrets of the Sargasso Sea* in the 1960s.³

Geographic scale and site integrity

The Sargasso Sea represents an entire ocean gyre system, surrounded by the Gulf Stream to the west, the North Atlantic Drift to the north, the more diffuse Canary Current to the east, and the North Equatorial Current and the Antilles Current to the south. The area thus acts as a functional unit and accordingly displays high site integrity.

Other comparable sites

Whilst floating algal communities exist in other regions of the world ocean, it is the areal extent of the *Sargassum* and the thickness of the mats it forms, along with their persistence, which attract and retain a great density and diversity of associated organisms, which distinguish the Sargasso Sea in significance from ecosystem from other drift algal habitats. The Sargasso Sea is also the northerly limit of persistent *Sargassum* presence.

References

Freestone, D. and Morrison, K. 2014. The Signing of the Hamilton Declaration on Collaboration for the Conservation of the Sargasso Sea: A new paradigm for high seas conservation? 29 *International Journal of Marine and*

³ Gregory, B. (w), Strobl, T. (p), Liggera, J. (i). 1960. "Secret Of The Sargasso Sea". Donald Duck. W DD 72-01.

- Coastal Law*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 345-62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/15718085-12341320>
- Freestone, D., Burnett, D. R., de Juvigny, A. L. and Davenport, T. M. 2015. Submarine telecommunication cables in the Sargasso Sea 30. *The International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 371-78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/15718085-12341358>
- Freestone, F., Roe, H. et al. 2015. Sargasso Sea, Chapter 50 in *The First Integrated World Ocean Assessment (First World Ocean Assessment)*, United Nations, New York . http://www.un.org/depts/los/global_reporting/WOA_RPROC/Chapter_50.pdf
- Freestone, D. and Bulger, F. 2016. The Sargasso Sea Commission: An innovative approach to the conservation of areas beyond national jurisdiction. 30 *Ocean Yearbook* pp.80-90.
- Gregory, B. (w), Strobl, T. (p), Liggera, J. (i). 1960. "Secret Of The Sargasso Sea". Donald Duck. W DD 72-01.
- Laffoley, D., Roe, H. et al. 2011. *The Protection and Management of The Sargasso Sea: The golden floating rainforest of the Atlantic Ocean. Summary Science and Supporting Evidence Case*. Sargasso Sea Alliance. <http://www.sargassoseacommission.org/storage/documents/Sargasso.Report.9.12.pdf>
- Lumpkin, R. and Johnson, G. J. 2013. Global ocean surface velocities from drifters: Mean, variance, El Nino–Southern Oscillation response, and seasonal cycle. *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, Vol. 118, pp. 2992–3006, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jgrc.20210>
- Verne, J. (author) and Miller, W. J. (trans). 1966. *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea*. Washington Square Press.

Appendix 5:

The Atlantis Bank

Illustration of potential Outstanding Universal Value in the High Seas

Name of area:

The Atlantis Bank

Location:

Southern Indian Ocean, extends from latitudes 32°38' S to 32°48' S, and longitudes 57°12' E to 57°20' E

Description

Deep in the sub-tropical waters of the Indian Ocean, there is an island. But this island's beaches, cliffs and headlands can only be visited by submarine, remote cameras or fish, for it lies at the bottom of the sea. The Atlantis Bank is a sunken tectonic fossil island, the first ever studied. The Bank rises 3,300 m from the bottom of the abyss, peaking 700 m below sea level. It is located at latitude 32° S and flanks the Atlantis II transform fracture zone on the Southwest Indian Ridge. It has a unique paleontological record and due to its research history is a seabed bank of great scientific significance. It was pivotal to understanding the geology of 'ultraslow' spreading seabed ridges. It is also of global value as it is a tectonic bank (rather than the more common volcanic type – hence a bank and not a seamount), consisting of a sunken fossil island (guyot) of crustal origin. The summit is capped by marine carbonate deposits and is largely flat where it was levelled off by sea level erosion during subsidence. The top of the bank covers at least 25 km² and because of its remarkable preservation of ancient island features, was named after the mythical island of Atlantis.

The bank was studied in depth during the Ocean Drilling Programme in 1999, and remains a major focus of research activity (such as a widely publicized 2016 attempt to drill down towards the mantle, deep beneath the ocean crust). Baines et al. (2003) and Palmiotto et al. (2013) report on the mechanisms that have given rise to the 120 km-long ridge of which Atlantis Bank is part. As a result of once being an island, the Atlantis Bank has two fossil beaches, lagoons and a submerged headland. About two-thirds of the bank is

covered by limestone, with ripple marks identical to those in the sand on exposed beaches. These were 'frozen' or lithified as rock millions of years ago, as the island sank. There are little pot holes ground into gabbro rock from wave erosion.

The complex geomorphology of old headlands, precipitous cliffs, stacks, beaches and lagoons (FAO, 2006; Rogers et al., 2012) harbours a very diverse deep-sea fauna at depths from 700 to 4,000 m (Rogers et al., 2012), characterized by large anemones, armchair-sized sponges and octocorals. Large and very ancient *Paragorgia* colonies are particularly notable. On a recent research cruise visiting several different seamounts on the Southwest Indian Ridge, it was the only bank on which large concentrations of pelagic armourhead fish (*Pseudopentaceros wheeleri*) were observed. It also hosts populations of alfonsino (*Beryx splendens*). Both have seen widespread depletion by fishing in other parts of the deep sea.

The Southwest Indian Ridge has attracted interest as a rich habitat for deep-water commercial fish species. It falls under the jurisdiction of the SIODFA. Partly due to its varied topography resulting in diverse habitats and diversity of species, the Atlantis Bank attracted additional scientific attention and was declared a BPA by SIODFA (FAO, 2006).

Jurisdiction – The Atlantis Bank lies entirely in the High Seas.

Competent Authorities – include Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC), the Southern Indian Ocean Deepwater Fisheries Association (SIODFA) and the International Seabed Authority (ISA).

Potential Outstanding Universal Value

Criterion viii – Major stages in Earth's history and geological processes

The Atlantis Bank is a remarkable, tectonic feature created by uplift at the Southwest Indian Ridge and subsequent subsidence. The Bank has an age of about 11 million years shown by its crustal core, was sub-aerially exposed to about

1,000 m altitude about 7 million years, and is capped by a carbonate platform dated between 4.5 and 2.3 million years, deposited when the island was subsiding and about 100-200 m below sea level. It now peaks at 700 meter below sea level. Its location at about 200 km from the spreading ridge, demonstrates slow movement characteristic of an ultra-slow spreading ridge. The Bank has a complex geomorphology of old headlands, precipitous cliffs, stacks, beaches and lagoons. While other examples may occur elsewhere, the Atlantis Bank is the best-documented and studied example of this type of 'cold' or tectonically-formed feature.

Criterion ix – Significant ecological and biological processes in the evolution of ecosystems, communities of plant and animals

The Atlantis Bank harbours a very diverse deep-sea fauna at depths from 700 to 4,000 m (Rogers et al., 2012). The Bank hosts diverse coral gardens and complex sea-cliff deep-sea communities characterized by large anemones, large sponges and octocorals. Large *Paragorgia* colonies are particularly notable. Rock outcrops, particularly along the edges of the summit host large stylasterid colonies, with the echinoid *Dermechinus horridus*. Spines of these urchins form the substratum for infauna around the outcroppings.

Small sharks occur on the Bank summit, including one as yet unidentified species. Solitary corals, also unidentified, occur on the summit. The eastern side of the Bank comprises rocky/boulder slopes with glass sponges and octocorals. The western side has rock buttresses flanking rock-slide features hosting rich benthic communities of large, armchair-sized sponges, glass sponges, anemones and predatory sea spiders.

Observations during JAMSTEC⁴ cruises on near-bottom and/or mesopelagic communities at depths from 750 to over 5,000 m show vertical stratification of Crow Shark (*Etmopterus pusillus*), Gilchrist's Orange Roughy (*Hoplostethus gilchristi*) and the Big-eye Dory (*Allocytus verrucosus*). Initial surveys of mid-water biomass by echosounding are not yet conclusive on how the Bank/ridge system affects pelagic fish abundance, though it is clear that the broader region provides significant prey species biomass that supports higher predators, notably macaroni penguin (*Eudyptes chrsolophus*, the largest consumer among seabird species) and southern elephant seal (Boersch-Supan et al., 2015).

Criterion x – Significant biological diversity and threatened species of OUV

The geology and oceanography of the Atlantis Bank has led to a highly unusual confluence of different habitats due to its unusual geological past. In 2012 it was considered of high significance under the CBD EBSA process as an area

that contains either (i) unique ('the only one of its kind'), rare ('occurs only in few locations') or endemic species, populations or communities, and/or (ii) unique, rare or distinct, habitats or ecosystems, and/or (iii) unique or unusual geomorphological or oceanographic features.⁵ It was also considered highly significant as an area containing habitat for the survival and recovery of endangered, threatened or declining species, or an area with significant assemblages of such species.

The Bank is a hotspot for biodiversity and is also rated as of high significance for a relatively high proportion of sensitive habitats, biotopes or species that are functionally fragile (highly susceptible to degradation or depletion by human activity or by natural events) or with slow recovery. It is of particular ecological and scientific value and is of importance for the preservation of pelagic armourhead on the Southwest Indian Ridge.

The deep sea south-west Indian Ocean fauna is relatively poorly known compared to the better-studied north Pacific and Atlantic. This is shown by species discoveries from recent expeditions covering primnoid octocorals (Taylor et al., 2013), lobsters (Ahyong, 2014), hyppolytid shrimp (Komai, 2013; Nye, 2013) and sea cucumbers (O'Loughlin et al., 2013), as well as of species assemblages on 'organic fall' habitats (e.g. wood, carcasses) (Amon et al., 2015). However, it is not currently known whether this is indicative of endemism at the regional level or just low historical sampling. These studies have demonstrated isolation among seamounts in the region, and thus of uniqueness of the Atlantis Bank.

Threats

The area appears to be important for pelagic armourhead, a valuable fishery species, and hosts vulnerable marine ecosystems, such as deep coral garden communities. Other seamounts on the Southwest Indian Ridge have experienced high fishing pressure, and it is known that deepwater species, of targeted fish and invertebrate species, have low reproductive rates and slow growth, thus take decades and maybe hundreds of years to recover from fishing. The complex topography of the Atlantis Seamount has protected it from past bottom-trawling activities, thus it may serve as a refuge for resource species targeted elsewhere.

The Atlantis Bank also has intact coral communities which are known to have been impacted significantly by bottom trawling on Southwest Indian Ridge seamounts (Rogers, 2012). Growth rates of structural stony coral species are known to be slow in the deep sea, thus they are highly vulnerable to damage from fishing, particularly bottom trawling. Areas physically damaged by human activities are likely to take hundreds of years to recover. This Bank is thus particularly important in preserving diverse seabed

⁴ Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology. See <http://www.jamstec.go.jp/e/about/equipment/ships/shinkai2000.html>

⁵ See <https://chm.cbd.int/database/record?documentID=204015>

communities on the Southwest Indian Ridge in sub-tropical waters.

Protection and management

The feature has been declared a Benthic Protection Area (BPA) by the Southern Indian Ocean Deepwater Fishers Association (SIODFA). However, there is evidence of fishing on the Bank in the form of trawling scars on landslide areas on the north-western side of the Bank. It is proposed as an Ecologically or Biologically Significant Area (EBSA) because it lies in sub-tropical waters and hosts high densities of pelagic armourhead and vulnerable marine ecosystems (coral garden and cliff communities).

Public awareness

Due to its uniqueness and scientific attention to it, the Atlantis Bank has featured in campaigns raising awareness about the vulnerability of seamounts, with expeditions writing articles (in *Oceanus* magazine in 1998 (<http://www.who.edu/services/communications/oceanusmag.050826/v41n1/dick.html>), in expedition blogs and media content (e.g. on the BBC, http://news.bbc.co.uk/earth/hi/earth_news/newsid_8363000/8363108.stm). Given its recognition as an EBSA, the Atlantis Bank also features in outreach materials on deep sea and seamount conservation, and is among the signature sites in the UNDP/IUCN GEF-funded project on seamounts in the south-west Indian Ocean (http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Environment%20and%20Energy/Water%20and%20Ocean%20Governance/Seamounts_Project.pdf).

Geographic scale and site integrity

The Atlantis Bank is a significant feature – rising up from over 5,000 m deep, it has a top at 700 m that occupies some 25 km². Whilst there has been limited impact already from fishing, it nevertheless represents a complete system of sufficient dimensions to safeguard its complex and rich diversity of habitats, ecosystems and species, but nevertheless of reasonable size that the whole system could be designated as a World Heritage site. It is also a distinct Bank from the surrounding seabed areas that are targeted for potential seabed mining concessions.

Other comparable sites

There are estimated to be over 100,000 seamounts one kilometre or larger globally,⁶ with an unclear number in the south-west Indian Ocean. The Atlantis Bank is unique for its combination of sub-tropical ocean setting, unusual geological history and ecological and species diversity. It also has a more extensive research history than other banks or seamounts, increasing its value as a reference site.

This Bank is not to be mistaken with the similarly-named Atlantis-Great Meteor Seamount Chain and the Atlantis-Plato-Cruiser-Great Meteor Seamount Group, which is a string of extinct submarine volcanoes (i.e. 'hot' seamounts) in the northern Atlantic Ocean.

References

- Ahyong, S. T. 2014. Deep-sea squat lobsters of the Munidopsis serricornis complex in the Indo-West Pacific, with descriptions of six new species (Crustacea: Decapoda: Munidopsidae). *Records of the Australian Museum*, Vol. 66, No. 3, pp. 197–216. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3853/j.2201-4349.66.2014.1630>
- Amon, D. J., Copley, J. T., Dahlgren, T. G., Horton, T., Kemp, K. M., Rogers, A. D. and Glover, A. G. 2015. Observations of fauna attending wood and bone deployments from two seamounts on the Southwest Indian Ridge. *Deep-Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 1–11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2015.07.003>
- Baines, A. G., Cheadle, M. J., Dick, H. J. B., Hosford Scheirer, A., John, B. E., Kuszniir, N. J. and Matsumoto, T. 2003. Mechanism for generating the anomalous uplift of oceanic core complexes: Atlantis Bank, Southwest Indian Ridge. *Geology*, Vol. 31, No. 12, pp. 1105–08. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1130/G19829.1>
- Boersch-Supan, P. H., Rogers, A. D. and Brierley, A. S. 2015. Author's Accepted Manuscript. *Deep-Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, pp. 1–40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2015.06.023>
- Clark M. R., Rowden A. A., Schlacher T. A., Guinotte J., Dunstan P. K., Williams A., O'Hara T. D., Watling, L., Niklitschek E. and Tsuchida S. 2014. Identifying Ecologically or Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs): A systematic method and its application to seamounts in the South Pacific Ocean. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, Vol. 91, pp. 65–79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2014.01.016>

⁶ See the Global Seamount Census. <http://topex.ucsd.edu/sandwell/publications/127.pdf>

- FAO. 2006. Management of demersal fisheries resources of the Southern Indian Ocean. Report of the fourth and fifth Ad Hoc Meetings on Potential Management Initiatives of Deepwater Fisheries Operators in the Southern Indian Ocean (Kameeldrift East, South Africa, 12–19 February 2006 and Albion, Petite Rivière, Mauritius, 26–28 April 2006) including specification of benthic protected areas and a 2006 programme of fisheries research. Compiled by Ross Shotton.
- Komai, T. 2013. A new species of the hippolytid genus *Paralebbeus* Bruce and Chace, 1986 (Crustacea: Decapoda: Caridea) from the Coral Seamount, southwestern Indian Ocean. *Zootaxa*, Vol. 3646, pp. 171–79.
- Lewis, R. L. et al. 2014. Global patterns of marine mammal, seabird, and sea turtle bycatch reveal taxa-specific and cumulative megafauna hotspots. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, Vol. 111, No. 14, pp. 5271–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1318960111>
- Nye, V. 2013. New species of hippolytid shrimps (Crustacea: Decapoda: Caridea: Hippolytidae) from a southwest Indian Ocean seamount. *Zootaxa*, Vol. 3637, No. 2, pp. 101–12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.3637.2.1>
- O’Loughlin, P. M., Mackenzie, M. and VandenSpiegel, D. 2013. New sea cucumber species from the seamounts on the Southwest Indian Ocean Ridge (Echinodermata: Holothuroidea: Aspidochirotida, Elaspodida, Dendrochirotida). *Memoirs of Museum Victoria*, Vol. 70, pp. 37–50. http://museumvictoria.com.au/pages/49228/037-050_mmv70_oloughlin_4.pdf
- Palmiotto, C., Corda, L., Ligl, M., Cipriani, A., Dick, H., Doubille, E., Gasperini, L., Montagna, P., Thil, F., Borsetti, A.M., Balestra, B. and Bonatti, E. 2013. Nonvolcanic tectonic islands in ancient and modern oceans. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems*, Vol. 14, No. 10, pp. 4698–4717. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ggge.20279>
- Robel, A. A., Lozier M. S., Gary S. F., Shillinger G. L., Bailey H. and Bograd S. J. 2011. Projecting uncertainty onto marine megafauna trajectories. *Deep-Sea Research Part I*, Vol. 58, pp. 915–21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2011.06.009>
- Rogers, A. D. 2012. Evolution and Biodiversity of Antarctic Organisms A Molecular Perspective, Antarctic Ecosystems. John Wiley and Sons Ltd., pp. 417–67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781444347241.ch14>
- Rogers, A. D. and Taylor, M. L. 2012. Benthic biodiversity of seamounts in the southwest Indian Ocean Cruise report – R/V James Cook 066 Southwest Indian Ocean Seamounts expedition – November 7th – December 21st, 2011. 235pp.
- Taylor, M. L., Cairns, S., Agnew, D. J. and Rogers, A. D. 2013. A revision of the genus *Thouarella* Gray, 1870 (Octocorallia: Primnoidae), including an illustrated dichotomous key, a new species description, and comments on *Plumarella* Gray, 1870 and *Dasystenella*, Versluys, 1906. *Zootaxa*, Vol. 3602, pp. 1–105. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.3602.1>
- Taylor, M. L. and Rogers, A. D. 2015. Evolutionary dynamics of a common sub-Antarctic octocoral family. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, Vol. 84, pp. 185–204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2014.11.008>
- Yesson, C., Clark, M. R., Taylor, M. and Rogers, A. D. 2011. The global distribution of seamounts based on 30-second bathymetry data. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers*, Vol. 58, No. 4, pp. 442–53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2011.02.004>

World Heritage

reports



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



World
Heritage
Convention

*For more information contact
UNESCO World Heritage Centre*

7, place Fontenoy
75352 Paris 07 SP France
Tel: 33 (0)1 42 68 43 78
Fax: 33 (0)1 45 68 55 70
Website: <http://whc.unesco.org>