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1. **Objective**

Inform respectively seek the decision of the Wadden Sea Board on a number of issues which cannot be postponed.

1. **Status**

In December last year the IUCN requested supplementary information on the Danish-German Extension Nomination on 4 issues of which two are directed at the Danish authorities and the other two are of a more general character and relate more or less to the property in general. The supplementary information must be delivered to the World Heritage Center at the end of February to be included in the further review of the nomination and the IUCN recommendation for the World Heritage Committee meeting in June this year.

The Task Group World Heritage met on 15 January 2014 to discuss the request and to agree the content, schedule and procedure to guarantee a smooth handling of the request which unfortunately collides with the preparation of the Ministerial Conference and therefore requires an even more planned implementation.

On the occasion of the meeting, the Task Group also discussed the Wadden Sea World Heritage Programme for 2014. A number of decisions have to be taken on budgets and activities to ensure that preparations can start already now.

1. **Decisions**

*Re. Supplementary Information*

The Task Group comprehensively discussed the request for supplementary information taking account of the experiences gained with the previous request during the 2008/09 nomination. Considering the circumstance that the nomination is an extension nomination, the current request is comprehensive and concerning. It is therefore essential that a response is provided that minimizes the risks for the approval of the nomination by the World Heritage Committee and does not raise further worrying questions which have to be addressed in preparation of and at the Committee meeting.

Two of the questions are directed to the authorities in Denmark and two are of a more general nature. The Task Group agreed on the outline, work division and schedule for the elaboration of the supplementary information in **Annex 1**. The strict adherence to the time schedule in the Annex 1 is necessary to allow for the consultation and agreement by the parties on the supplementary information.

Proposal

Underline adherence to the strict deadline for the delivery including consultation and agreement on the supplementary information.

*Re. Wadden Sea World Heritage Strategy*

According to the draft Council Declaration (12.12.13), the Wadden Sea Board (WSB) is instructed “with the further consultation of a strategy with the aim of having it signed by the strategic partners on the occasion of the foreseen inscription of the Danish World Heritage site”. Under the assumption that the strategy to which is referred is the one which has been under discussion, there is a need to take a couple of steps immediately after the conference to ensure that a strategy can be signed some 4 months afterwards.

As a first step, the Task Group suggests to define the strategic partners referred to in the strategy until mid of March (15.3) and in the two months period until mid of May (15.5) enter into discussion with the strategic partners with the aim to reach consensus on the strategy in order to approve the strategy at the WSB meeting in June 2014 and arrange the signing round or event. This could e.g. also be associated with the campaign on the occasion of the 5 year anniversary/Danish inscription.

Proposal

Instruct the TG-WH to start process and report.

*Re. Wadden Sea World Heritage Programme 2014/Update*

The Task Group took stock of the 1) budget payments for 2014 on the programme and 2) the update activities of the World Heritage material on the occasion of the inscription of the Danish-German extension.

Germany and the Netherlands have provided the financing for the 2014 programme. Denmark should hence pledge its budget to the period after the inscription.

In addition, both Niedersachsen and Denmark should now guarantee budget shares for the update of WH Material as consequence of the inscription of the Danish part and extension of the Lower Saxon part to ensure that the activities can start right after the conference and material can be made available on 20/21 June 2014 (date of inscription).

Proposal

Denmark to provide budget share on the World Heritage programme.

Denmark and Lower Saxony to provide budget for the update of the existing World Heritage material.

*Re. Campaign 2014*

The Task Group agreed on an outline for the campaign on the occasion of the Danish-German extension inscription and the celebration of the 5 year anniversary including a budget as instructed by WSB 10 in **Annex 2**. The TG-WH regarded this proposal as the only possibility to organize a joint campaign in summer 2014.

Proposal

To approve of Annex 2 including budget shares and instruct the secretariat together with the regional focal points to organize the campaign.

1. **Proposal**

In summary, the WSB is **proposed** to

1. Underline adherence to the strict deadline for the delivery of the supplementary information in accordance with **Annex 1**.
2. Instruct the TG-WH to start process on the draft World Heritage Strategy and report.
3. Denmark to provide budget share on World Heritage programme 2014; Denmark and Germany/Lower Saxony to provide budget for update of the existing World Heritage material,
4. Approve of the Campaign outline including budget shares in **Annex 2** and instruct the secretariat together with the regional focal points to organize the campaign.

**Annex 1**

**EXTENSION NOMINATION DANISH-GERMAN WADDEN SEA - REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION, DECEMBER 2013: OUTLINE OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION TO BE DELIVERED**

**Procedure:**

Requested information to be delivered jointly as one single response through the Danish delegation/permanent representative at the UNESCO also on behalf of Germany; Danish representative coordinates delivery with the German representative at UNESCO.

The format for the delivery of the supplementary information would be similar to the delivery in February 2009.

**Schedule**:

1. The lead partner indicated below elaborates a draft text which will be circulated, consulted and agreed within TG-WH in accordance with the summary of the supplementary information indicated in the table below and send it to the CWSS **11 February 2014** at the latest
2. The CWSS collates the information into one document and circulates it to the members of the TG-WH for internal consultation on **12 February 2014** with a consultation and approval period of one week, i.e. 19 February 2014.
3. The CWSS reviews eventual comments and finalizes the dossier in accordance with the Operational Guidelines (3 copies etc.) and on **21 February 2014,** after a final approval of the state parties, as appropriate, ships the package to the Danish Cultural Agency which will be responsible for the further timely delivery in Paris on 28 February 2014 at the latest.

**Outline of the Delivery**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **IUCN Request (letter 13 December 2013)** | **Outline of the Supplementary Information to be delivered** | **Responsible** |
| 1 | The nomination proposes the inclusion of the government-owned parts of the barrier **islands of Rømø and Fanø (in Denmark)**, where public access is allowed within the nominated area and where human pressure and associated threats are and will have potential to impact the property, particularly parts of the beaches on Rømø and Fanø islands that are heavily used by private vehicles. Considering that the mission understood those activities will continue in future, the State Party is requested to submit additional information on the reasons for including these parts in the property and the measures that will be taken to reduce the impacts, or to consider revising the boundaries so as to exclude those heavily impacted areas from this nomination. | IUCN considers such activities incompatible with the conditions of integrity, the World Heritage Committee is highly likely to follow the IUCN assessment in this regard.  Comparable request was done to the state parties in 2009 and resulted in the exclusion of areas used for exploration/exploitation oil and gas and military activities.  It was **agreed** that   * It was indispensable to interpret the request by the IUCN broadly, i.e. encompassing all actual and potential human pressures and threats, * In the further process including the meeting of the World Heritage Committee any risk should be avoided that could lead to further questions (explaining reasons for inclusion or additional management measures), discussions and recommendations and hence jeopardize the inscription * The only option would be to exclude those areas, i.e. to revise the boundaries accordingly * The revision of the boundaries should be aligned with the revision made in 2009 regarding oil and gas exploitation/exploration and military activities   There were no activities as indicated in the letter within the nominated property on Fanø and the request therefore was confined to Rømø.  Delivery  Taking account of the above starting points it was concluded that the boundary on Rømø should be revised to exclude the entire government owned area/beach which would align the boundary with the island of Fanø.  An associated brief text should be made accordingly.  CWSS will upon delivery of the exact revised boundary deliver new maps and tables to be included as attachment 1 in the supplementary information. | DK in cooperation with CWSS: Information – maps - tables |
| 2 | We would appreciate if the State Party could provide a succinct summary, and the relevant supporting documentation, outlining the **collaboration between the Danish Nature Agency** **and the Danish Wadden Sea National Park authority related to the nominated property,** including division of roles and responsibilities. | During the field mission there was considerable uncertainty about the status of the Danish National Park and relationship with the World Heritage. Danish National Park does not immediately fit into the IUCN categories of protected areas, and there is therefore a need to clarify that the responsibility for the World Heritage solely rests with the Nature Agency and that the national park can only be supportive.  The Danish National Park is difficult to place in the IUCN category system of protected areas because it does not in itself provide any legal protection. Possibly category VI would apply  The request is not only confined to the formal relationship with the National Park but also the roles and responsibilities.  Delivery  Nature Agency to provide the requested summary and documentation. This information should specifically relate to and extend the information in ch. 5 of the nomination document and relate to the above.  It is suggested to consider clarifying the specific relationship of the National Park with regard to the World Heritage in a relationship document between the Agency and the National Park Board. It must be made clear that the National Park Board is fully subject to the commitments ensuing from the World Heritage and must fully respect the trilateral World Heritage context. | DK |
| 3 | It was stated during the mission, in both Denmark and Germany, and that the **wind farms** do not have significant impact on bird populations and that environmental impact studies have been carried out to demonstrate this. We would be grateful to receive copies of the relevant sections of these assessments and a brief summary of the conclusions regarding impact, and the reasoning for this, together with information on measures that have been taken (or are planned for) to avoid impacts. We noted that one recent paper pointed out the impact that power lines (from the wind farms) across the tidal flats to Fanø and Rømø have on large numbers of birds (Rasmussen 2008), and would appreciate the comments of the State Party/ies on this matter. We would further welcome clarification regarding how the cumulative and incremental impacts of different developments has been considered, and also a succinct statement on the anticipated approach to further developments. | Issue discussed during the field mission, field mission experts displayed considerable unfamiliarity with the issue and the policies in the context of the Wadden Sea and it is therefore necessary to collate the information on what is available in terms of expert statements on impacts and the policies with regard to construction offshore wind farms, cable construction etc.  Delivery  Delivery should refer to trilateral agreements (WSP 2010, Ministerial Declarations etc.) and be confined to a general statement that the construction of wind power in the World Heritage area/conservation Area is prohibited cf. WSP, additionally been addressed at several ministerial meetings.  Wind farms established landwards and offshore at a distance from the property.  Specifically response to the 4 questions:   * Copies of the relevant sections etc… including the information Denmark (Horns Rev) * Conclusions regarding impact (incl. reasoning for this) and measures; specifically point out that most of the species for which the Wadden Sea has been listed are not relevant * Response overhead power lines to the Danish islands, contradict the statement made in Rasmussen; can a statement be made that indicated that when renewing the power lines state of the art underground technic will be used? * Cumulative/incremental impacts – refer to requirements of EU legislation | Nds lead with input DK |
| 4 | We would appreciate further information about who develops the **grazing** plans for the property, and notably for the Danish extension how much control the Nature Agency and/or Park has over these plans, what research and monitoring is being undertaken to determine the optimum level of grazing, and who is responsible for control and enforcement of the grazing plan. | Lack of coherent data (GIS data) from DK on distribution and development of TMAP salt marsh vegetation types and grazing intensity as documented in the QSR 2004 and 2009. Existing information not aligned with NL and D GIS data to allow a joint assessment.  Delivery  Delivery to be preceded by a brief overall statement on salt marsh management/WSP targets, e.g. summary of what was delivered in the first nomination document, what is included in the current followed by a focussed response to the 3 questions:   * Who develops grazing plans, Nature Agency control over these plans (Rasmussen, page 28 is maybe also a source for the question) * Research and monitoring – optimum level issue (refer to Wadden Sea Day 2013). * Control and enforcement to be combined with first bullet   Information to include a statement that the DK extension fits to the existing property and that DK fully adheres to TMAP and WSP. | SH-CWSS with input of DK |

**Annex 2**

**Draft World Heritage Campaign 2014**

**A journey through the Wadden Sea**

**Highlights of the Wadden Sea World Heritage -**

**Celebrating five years of global excellence**

**22 January 2014**

**1. Background**

With the expected extension of the Wadden Sea World Heritage with the Danish Wadden Sea (as requested by the World Heritage Committee in 2009), a five-year journey has been concluded: The entire Wadden Sea stretching along the North Sea coast of the Netherlands, Germany and Denmark is now on the World Heritage List – a recognition of its global importance and its excellence in management.

Celebrating these five years of global excellence is an opportunity to be recognized by people in the region as a truly international joined and responsible entity, to promote the transnational Wadden Sea World Heritage, and creating pride amongst locals and visitors: Three countries – one World Heritage – our common future.

Only very few people have experienced the entire Wadden Sea coast of almost 500 km and have an image of the variety of landscapes, the nature values and people living in the region. A journey through the Wadden Sea is an experience of its own.

**2. Objectives**

The overall aim of a journey through the Wadden Sea World Heritage is to

1. Make people aware of the pure size of the Wadden Sea, its nature values and diversity, and its integrity.
2. Promote the global importance of the Wadden Sea,
3. Enhance understanding of the shared responsibility for its protection for present and future generations,
4. Communicate the Danish extension which strengthens the integrity of the World Heritage site.

**3. The concept**

A journey through the entire Wadden Sea to experience the most important feature, its global importance and its protection is a challenging project in terms of resources and time. Therefore, multipliers such as journalists should be approached which will be able to share the experience of such a trip to a larger audience thus enhancing the awareness of the broader public for the Wadden Sea experience and protection.

A team of 1-2 journalists from each Wadden Sea region or country will attend the entire journey to get an impression of the entire area, different languages and cultures. This concept of multi-national team will also trigger discussions on similarities and differences between the regions and countries.

The journey will encompass nature experience in combination with meetings of local actors in the region and representatives from various sectors to enhance understanding of the protection of the area but also to illustrate existing conflicts or challenges.

The trip itself will not have a trilateral event character. Therefore, local World Heritage events will be organized by the countries in which a visit of the journalists can be integrated (e.g. by interviews, round tables, panel discussions, presentations) which will attract local media attention.

Added value of the concept:

* it offers a new and unique experience for key-multipliers,
* it will results in high quality articles and features by the journalists (covering a longer time period and various media channels)
* local stakeholders and nature administrations can promote their messages to a larger and new audience.
* If can be combined or integrated with regional events.

**4. Implementation**

Participants:

* 6-8 journalists (1-2 from the Netherlands, Lower Saxony, Hamburg, Schleswig-Holstein and Denmark),
* 2-3 representatives from the region attending the trip in their part of the Wadden Sea (national park, tourism),
* 1-2 scientists/WH-experts attending the entire trip.

Travel:

* Transportation by boat: at least once per regions, otherwise by car and ferry,
* Flight(s) along part of the WH coast,
* Local transport means (horse carriage),
* Mud flat tours (transportation of material by ferry).

Schedule:

* 5-10 days (to specified)
* Period June 2014 (to be specified
* Start: Texel
* End: Römö (at or after the inscription)

**5. Indicative Budget**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **What** | **Indicative Costs (to specified)** |
| 1 | Transportation | 8.000 |
| 2 | Accommodation | 8.000 |
| 3 | Meals | 3.000 |
| 4 | Local events | 8.000 |
| 4 | Other costs | 3.000 |
|  | **Total costs** | **30.000** |
|  |  |  |
|  | **To be covered by the countries(NL, FRG, DK)** | 10.000 per state party |
|  |  |  |