



St Helena World Heritage Status Scoping Group Report
July 2019

Executive Summary

Early in 2019, a Scoping Group (hereafter referred to as Group) was established to review St Helena's current position in relation to the Island's 2012 UK Tentative Listing for World Heritage Status (WHS) with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). UK Tentative Listing is the first step to designation of WHS.

The Group's intention was to collate and synthesise the available information and knowledge; this included consulting experts both on and off-island to establish St Helena's current potential Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) – the measure which determines whether or not a site meets the WHS requirements, and to identify and stress-test the options now available to the Island.

The Group did not set out to answer the question of whether or not a full application should be made, but it did set out to confirm the Island's current position and to produce a Position Statement in relation to progressing any potential full WHS application. It is acknowledged that Tentative Listing can be lost if insufficient progress has been made over a reasonable period. UNESCO encourages State Parties to conduct reviews of their Tentative List every 10 years, which means that if St Helena intends to remain on the list, it does need to move quickly to evidence that intent and start to make progress towards a full application.

The original application was for mixed site status (i.e. meeting both natural and cultural criteria). However, the Tentative Listing only recognised the natural criteria, as the UK Independent WHS Expert Panel (Panel) were not convinced by the case for cultural OUV.

The Group believes that a stronger case can be made for a mixed site than a natural site alone. This is because meeting the OUV criteria for integrity remains a challenge. The Island will need to demonstrate that the scale of recovery and restoration efforts demonstrates that values are preserved and can be in perpetuity and because significance of the Island's cultural heritage is recognised amongst experts, with particular reference to Jamestown "*from the Steps to Maldivia*", and with the potential to include fortifications and wider heritage landscape.

The Group considers that what sets St Helena's OUV apart from every other WHS listing is the notion of the Island as an 'East India Company island'. Jamestown, the wharf area and the Island's fortifications provide a coherent cultural, historical and environmental narrative that is still evident today – this was not an argument made in the original application.

In order to pursue this, the Island will need to take advantage of the invitation by the Panel to conduct further investigation of the cultural values to see if there is a case for future nomination as a cultural landscape under cultural criteria. Whilst the Group is highlighting the potential OUV as a mixed site, it is NOT recommending that a full application is progressed at this stage. The Group is clear that the most appropriate next step is to develop a full analysis of the implications and costs of WHS designation. Whilst designation is likely to bring additional benefits, the potential costs may also be high. Literature review indicated benefits ... but this part of the work is far from complete. Commitment to a full application should only progress with the full support of the community once there is a clear understanding of any obligations that WHS designation would involve.

The Group's work of fact-finding around St Helena's potential OUV, and stress-testing of the options now available to the Island, has synthesised available information and knowledge, and established dialogue with experts ready to provide support, as necessary. A significant degree of additional work is still required to understand whether or not the Island should progress to a full WHS application.

The Group has developed an informed view of the most useful, practicable and appropriate next steps, and the Group makes recommendations to St Helena Government on how the work should be progressed.

Recommended Next Steps:

- To continue to investigate the development of a full nomination for World Heritage Site Status and to do so in a timely manner so as to have made progress, acknowledged and supported by the St Helena and UK Governments before the next UK Tentative Listing Review.
- To develop a full analysis of the implications and costs of WHS designation, and the nature of the status (as a natural or mixed site) in order that a recommendation on whether to proceed or not can be made to Executive Council.
- This work should be led by a World Heritage Community Steering Committee (the Committee)

The Committee will be tasked with gaining enough knowledge, data and understanding of local opinion to support a conclusive decision on whether it is in the Island's best interests to progress a full nomination for World Heritage Site Status and what that bid should be. The Committee should comprise a broad group of key individuals who are able and willing to share the tasks and decisions required, establish a strong stakeholder partnership approach, represent key stakeholders and embrace sustainable development at the core.

In the event of a positive decision from Executive Council to proceed with a full nomination, the Committee will be responsible for developing the St Helena World Heritage Implementation Plan - securing public support and Government approval to proceed and to develop the strongest possible UNESCO World Heritage Site application.

A draft terms of Reference for the Committee (have been drafted by the Group and are presented in Annex 10.

- Identify funding opportunities. Funding will be need to be support the next steps in the process. The Committee should take advice in the first instance on how the feasibility work may be funded (although early indications to the Group have been that World Heritage Status may be an area of interest for the Foreign & Commonwealth Office, as well as DCMS).
- The Group considers that specific expertise is needed to assist the Committee in determining the social, economic and environmental impacts of World Heritage Site Status for St Helena. As a minimum this should include opportunities and obligations around preservation, conservation, planning, costs, social, economic and environmental benefits, resources needed, and any legislative, regulatory or management changes required for both options. Further details about securing the support of a consultant to work with the World Heritage Steering Committee, is given in the Steering Committee Draft Terms of Reference.
- Communicating with the public about World Heritage is a vital part of the process. The Island's position on the Tentative List, has not been widely publicised locally and is not well known. There has been no public engagement as part of the work of this Group, which was focused on fact finding. The Steering Committee will need to prepare a communication strategy, setting out how to communicate with the public, stakeholders and decision-makers to ensure that all recommendations and decisions fully reflect the broadest possible views of St Helena.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to everyone who has so willingly provided guidance and information through this process. We have relied heavily on your expertise in preparing this Position Statement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Executive Summary

Acknowledgements

Introduction

1

Background

2-3

Scoping Group Process and Activities

4

Summary Fact Finding and Observations

5-7

SWOT Analysis

8-16

Gap Analysis

17-18

Recommendations for Next Steps

19-20

Annexes

21

1. Introduction

St Helena's unique natural and cultural heritage has long been recognised as being outstanding; consideration has been given to the potential for formal recognition of values, including Ramsar Site and UNESCO WHS. St Helena's first attempts to secure WHS recognition, having been nominated in 1986 under natural criteria for High Peak and Diana's Peak, was withdrawn 1987. However, an application made in 2011 to the UK for Tentative Listing led by St Helena National Trust was successful.

The Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) manages UK's obligations as a State Party to the UNESCO World Heritage Convention, and St Helena's successful application has been on the Tentative List of WHS sites since 2012. Securing this nomination to the Tentative List is the essential first step in the process towards submitting a full nomination to UNESCO for designation as a WHS Site.

Significant effort contributed to the successful Tentative Listing, this included securing St Helena Government support and commitment to support the process (Tourism Development Plan, 2012-2016) and underpinning management framework (the Historic Environment Record and Conservation Management Plan as set out in the Land Development Control Plan (LDCP) 2012); support from the French Government was also expressed. Despite this initial success, focus on achieving WHS waned during the period the Island was preparing for air access, and during the construction of St Helena Airport. So, whilst important foundations were laid, since 2012 there was little real activity to progress from Tentative List to full application. In October 2018, Hon. Christine Scipio asked what action had been taken to progress St. Helena's position on the Tentative List at the Formal Sitting of Legislative Council.

Following Hon. Christine Scipio's ongoing questions which highlighted the possibility of the Tentative List being updated, and the related risk of St Helena's listing falling 'out of time', Governor Honan spoke to Chief Executive Economic Development (CEED) Dr Dawn Cranswick, and the matter was prioritised by Enterprise St. Helena. Unfortunately, changes in roles and individuals on island since 2012, coupled with very few available records, complicated matters. It was also apparent that in the previous seven years, a range of factors pertinent to the Island's natural and cultural heritage had changed. Therefore, the first task was to understand the changes that have happened on the island since the original application was submitted, and to collate the relevant information available now to establish recommendations about any full application.

A small strategic Group was formed of Hon. Christine Scipio, Dr Rebecca Cairns-Wicks MBE and chaired by Dr. Dawn Cranswick, with the specific purpose of developing a Position Statement to clarify '*where are we now?*' in relation to progressing any potential full WHS application. The time-frame established for the Group was deliberately short, and the Group was clear that its purpose was to answer a set of specific questions relating to any potential full application. (Scoping Group Terms of Reference are available at Annex 1). The Group was also clear that if they could not answer all the questions within the short time-frame, this would be a valid finding which would be reported, and would feed into any recommendations about next steps.

Background

World Heritage Sites are sites considered to be of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). UNESCO defines OUV as meaning “*cultural and, or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity*”. They represent the most significant or exceptional examples of the world’s cultural and natural heritage.

To be included on the World Heritage List, sites must be of OUV and meet at least one out of ten selection criteria, evidencing integrity, authenticity and management. These criteria are explained in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention which, besides the text of the Convention, is the main working tool on World Heritage. These criteria are regularly revised by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee (WHC) to reflect the evolution of the World Heritage concept. (The full list of criteria is included at Annex 2)

Sites can only be nominated for inclusion on the World Heritage List by a national government. Once nominated, they undergo rigorous evaluation by Advisory Bodies: ICOMOS (for cultural sites) or IUCN (for natural sites) or both (for mixed sites and cultural landscapes), who make a recommendation to the WHC. The whole process takes at least 18 months from the submission of the nomination to the WHC session when the nomination will be considered. Only the WHC can decide whether or not a site has OUV and should be placed on the List. Success is not assured.

Before any site can be nominated it must first be on the State Parties Tentative List, in our case the UK, which is a list of places that the Government considers it may nominate in future years. The Tentative List has to be formally submitted to UNESCO. UNESCO expects Tentative Lists to be reviewed about once a decade.

St Helena’s application for Tentative Listing in 2011 was for ‘mixed’ status, meaning that both cultural and natural aspects included in the bid were argued to be of potential OUV. (A copy of the original bid is included at Annex 3.)

St Helena’s bid was successfully nominated for a natural site under criterion (x) ***contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of Outstanding Universal Value from the point of view of science or conservation.*** The cultural criterion referenced in the application was (vi) ***be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance.***

In response to St Helena’s application, the Panel recommendation was that St Helena had “*Potential OUV under natural criteria only because of the high number of endemic species and genera and the range of habitats, from cloud forest to desert, representing a biome of great age which exists nowhere else on earth. There should be further investigation of the cultural values to see if there is a case for future nomination as a cultural landscape under cultural criteria. Questions of integrity will need to be addressed in the nomination, especially as a previous nomination was withdrawn on that score. Future sustainable management will have to be carefully managed if access to the Island is improved.*”

The Panel’s recommendation means that St Helena could make a supplementary case to add cultural criteria to bring it back to a mixed site, if it so chooses. The WHC considers that criterion (vi) should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria. In so doing therefore St Helena would need to carry out further investigation of its cultural values to broaden the criteria for full nomination.

When the bid was originally submitted in 2011, the current boundaries and descriptions of the island’s National Conservation Areas (NCA), Historic Conservation Areas (HCA) and Marine Protected Area (MPA)

were not available (LDCP, 2012, and MPAs are included at Annex 4). Instead earlier boundary descriptions (LDCP, 2007) were used for the land-based values. Marine values were not included.

The protection, management, authenticity and integrity of properties are also important considerations. Since 1992 significant interactions between people and the natural environment have been recognized as cultural landscapes.

2. Scoping Group Process and Activities

The Group's purpose was to update all relevant information, to reflect the current state of affairs in relation to the island's natural and cultural values.

The Group collated and reviewed all available information and knowledge gathered to date by various local stakeholders, and then worked to identify what additional information was needed to make a recommendation on whether to proceed (or not). As well as looking specifically at St Helena, the Group considered a list of comparators and drew on relevant examples of designated WHS sites from other small islands, other tourism-driven economies and other British Overseas Territories, with the intention of understanding what difference WHS designation had made, particularly in relation to economic factors. (Site Comparators table is included at Annex 5).

Once all the available documentation had been collated, it was apparent that additional expert knowledge was required.

Specific questions around the criteria for WHS were framed, and posed to individuals with expert knowledge of the island, both local and international. A meeting was arranged with the experts on island to gather information, with the focus on fact-finding. Electronic communications facilitated the contact with international experts, and those based on island but unable to attend the meeting. (The presentation used at this discussion event is included at Annex 6).

This local and international expert knowledge underpins the Group's recommendations, and is intended to support any decision on whether or not St Helena develops and submits a full application for WHS, and critically, to help determine the nature of any application (i.e. natural, cultural or mixed).

The Group reviewed the process for any intended full application for WHS and now makes recommendations for next steps.

3. Summary Fact-finding and Observations

This section highlights key points from the Group's 'discovery' work; a more substantive discussion of the facts and observations is included at Annex 7.

The 2011 bid identified "The island of St Helena", highlighting the range of habitat and species diversity and endemism and the cultural heritage testament to the zenith of the vanished great age of seafaring, and the heyday of the British Empire, a cross roads and place of exile and liberation; however, the bid didn't intend to extend status to the whole of the island, but to a collection of sites. This section explores the options available now, and their related challenges, in the event of a decision being made to progress to full application.

A SWOT analysis has been used to assess the natural, terrestrial and marine and cultural values.

4.1 Natural

A natural bid based on criterion (x) alone has potential to meet the criteria for OUV, and this has been accepted by the UK Government, in accepting St Helena on to the Tentative List.

St Helena and its 200 nautical mile zone MPA are home to 612 endemic species¹. This is a biological heritage of global value, and one that is likely to increase as more species are discovered and described through future research into lesser known groups and habitats. St Helena presents an evolutionary hotspot in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean. With its diversity of habitats and species, St Helena is home to almost one third of all UK and UK Overseas Territories endemic species.

Nonetheless, St Helena's habitats and species are also highly disturbed and threatened. The historic scale of habitat loss was massive, a swift and irreversible change brought about by people following settlement and fortification that has shaped and modified the landscape over the last five centuries. This disturbance to natural habitats inevitably leads to uncertainty as to whether OUV can be demonstrated.

In 2012, the Panel stated that "*Future sustainable management will have to be carefully managed if access to the Island is improved.*" The island's legal and management framework for land use management and conservation has advanced since 2012.

Progress in conservation and habitat restoration on the island in recent years, and the knowledge gained through this, suggests that there is now some evidence of functioning ecosystems. Consistent effort over the last decade to build nursery and productive capacity has also laid the ground work for a transformational change in scale of restoration efforts.

Nonetheless, there remain knowledge gaps in fungi, soil biota and an understanding of the relationships between biodiversity (both native and non-native) and ecological health and function. More research is needed to determine what level of evidence base would satisfy questions of ecosystem integrity and function, as well as the requirement to understand the obligations and restrictions St Helena would face with respect to the natural environment.

Whilst the whole island approach adopted in 2011 makes sense, it does present dislocated sites. These could be 'joined' by including landscape considerations; St Helena's geographical location and isolation has determined the process of natural colonisation, in terms of the bird, plant, fungi and invertebrate species that reached St Helena's shores and became established. The island's volcanic origin and landscape has shaped the natural processes of colonisation, succession, adaptation and island evolution.

¹ This includes: 45 vascular plants; 26 bryophytes; 10 lichens; 455 terrestrial invertebrates; more than 50 marine invertebrates; 25 marine fish (including 16 species that are only found in St Helena and Ascension waters).

An area not considered at all in 2011 is the marine habitat – current knowledge suggest that there is potential marine OUV, with the mega fauna species considered most notable, especially in relation to emerging knowledge about their behaviours in St Helena waters.

4.2 Cultural

St Helena has potential OUV for cultural heritage, with Jamestown likely to provide the most persuasive site “*from the Steps to Maldivia*”, with the potential to include fortifications.

The Group’s findings highlight that if Jamestown is to be included, significant additional advice would be essential - especially around the implications of designation for residents and businesses. There would also be a need for rigorous awareness-raising with the community on the limitations and UNESCO obligations for this area.

Development is considered a threat to the integrity and authenticity of Jamestown, the wharf and detached fortifications. Neglect, through lack of resources, has perversely contributed to retaining values and features that might have otherwise been lost to development before robust planning systems are in place. Other threats, including changing sea conditions, have also led to loss. Repairs and re-builds (following white ant introduction for example) have generally retained the character of buildings, using the local expertise and materials available at the time.

There is an opportunity for an holistic approach which recognises that on a small island, everything - past, present and future - is connected. Potential elements could include:

4.2.1 *East India Company wharf and Jamestown*

Considered as potentially the key element, as it gives critical mass (integrity may be in question if a smaller sub-section of the town is put forward):

“The English East India Company (EIC) was the largest and most influential company the world has known. It rose to account for half the world’s trade. At the height of its rule in India it had a private army twice the size of the British army. St Helena played a key role in bringing this about, particularly after the Dutch invasion and recapture by the English in 1673. During the early days of sail and trade with the Far East there were vital victualling stops, especially on the homeward run. After provisioning at Madagascar in the Indian Ocean, the next stop was the Cape. The EIC sailing ships, unable to stop there as it was a stronghold of the Dutch had to stop at St Helena. Had it not been for St Helena, the EIC would not have developed to be the global company it was, which in turn led to Britain taking over the vast subcontinent of India. St Helena is the first place outside Britain that the EIC took possession of as a British Island – English at the time as it took place before the union with Scotland. The uninhabited and isolated island was settled by people from England and was run as a company island.”²

4.2.2 *Island fortifications – the EIC landscape*

The fortifications all formed part of the East India Company defensive system, with related (but detached) fortifications at Ladder Hill, High Knoll, Banks’ Battery, Lemon Valley, plus possibly isolated defences elsewhere, e.g. Sandy Bay.

Inclusion of Lemon Valley reinforces history of early settlement and fortification, and growth of a different EIC life: fishermen’s cottages, plantation farming, quarantine and the care and management of African’s freed from trafficking.

4.2.3 *Broader EIC landscape*

² Basil George

A wider East India Company landscape would be an opportunity to recognise the generations of slaves who enabled the economic growth and development of the island during the EIC period, and St Helena's role in the history of freeing Africans who were trafficked across the Atlantic.

The significance of slaves on St Helena during the time of the EIC for almost two centuries connected with slavery in the Indian Ocean. "One of the significant aspects of global importance under the EIC was the introduction of slaves mostly from countries on the rim of the Indian Ocean. Slaves were introduced from the outset and became the largest of the three main groups of island society The significance of slaves on St Helena during the time of the EIC for almost two centuries connected with slavery in the Indian Ocean would stand alone to make the East India Company wharf and Jamestown a World Heritage site.... Society under the EIC was divisive with different laws for the three main groups of settlers, military, slaves and other racial groups like Chinese Indentured labourers. Within a few generations after the abolition of slavery in 1834, these diverse groups became integrated with a common identity. This is of global significance where vestiges of slavery and race continue to be divisive."³

St Helena's links to global history and past values are clear: "St Helena was transferred to the Crown under the 1833 India Act... Leading up to India becoming independent, this Act was cancelled except for the Article on St Helena. It is now called the St Helena Charter Act 1833⁴."

The island's role as a prison to Napoleon, Boer War Prisoners and, Zulu Rebels who rose up against British rule, can all be viewed as important to world heritage.

³ Basil George

⁴ Basil George

SWOT Analysis of Values

Natural – Terrestrial criteria (x)			
Strength	Weakness	Opportunity	Threat
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognised potential OUV for biodiversity values -greater understanding of endemism & island evolutionary importance Knowledge of biodiversity and ecosystems - concentration of biodiversity - Peaks cloud forest - Prosperous Bay Plain – & more to find • Good examples of habitat restoration & established techniques on which to be optimistic about long-term stability. • Species and habitats safeguarded through current programmes. • Protection and management – legal & policy framework for conservation (LDPC, 2012, EPO, 2016) • Network of protected areas - National Parks, Nature Reserves, IBA/Key Biodiversity Areas • Political support - Endorsement of Peaks Management Plan • Shared responsibility - Government, non-Government (National Trust, SNCG) and society (schools, volunteering) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrity - uncertainty about & evidencing OUV <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ no pristine habitats – highly disturbed, question of quality? ➤ Scale – small scale – evidencing size sufficient to protect integrity and sustainable in perpetuity ➤ evidence of ecologically functioning habitats - loss halted, reversing or declining across all or some • threat of extinctions • National Conservation Areas are not legally designated ➤ Ability for maintenance and enhancement - how can we improve habitats outside of main sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIC landscape/Green Imperialism – only EIC Company island – EIC led to development of ports and influenced planning and design, but where else did it settle and fortify a whole island and have an impact on a much bigger landscape – an island dedicated to supporting and protecting trade. Island’s disturbed nature, valuable history in colonial expansion and human impact on fragile island habitats; lessons learnt to share to help tackle global extinction crisis • Reinforcement and recognition of achievement – pride/optimism • Tourism branding – Company Island • Biodiversity valuable for evolutionary biology research • Understanding obligations and restrictions as a result of WHS • Management framework - Peaks NP Management Plan, 2019 • UK Government funding for Environment, including Peaks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of functionality dependent on intensive conservation management • Invasive species • Climate change • Edge effects remain an issue with small scale. • Habitat degradation due to off-road driving • Enforcement remains a challenge, more resources are needed to support enforcement. Loss of wilderness experience - in an effort to cater for all • Encroachment of development within open landscapes (PBP) • Tourism (still at very low level)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civil society engagement - Peaks building on experience of Millennium Forest • Private Sector - Connect - water catchment management • International support • Commitment & achievements in species recovery and habitat restoration • Knowledge of terrestrial biodiversity - inventories, status (IUCN Red Listing), ecology, autecology (spiky yellow woodlouse, Wirebird) • Knowledge of threats - invasive species inventories, ecology • Management of threats - biosecurity -reducing risk of new introductions, managing existing threats through ecological weed control methods) • Demonstrable success - Peaks, PBP? • Demonstrable commitment to enhancement - Peaks National Park Management Plan • Examples of resilience and recovery – bastard gumwood, gumwood, seabirds nesting on the mainland 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stepping stone - RAMSAR for Peaks, Fisher's, Coast and off shore islands • World leader in critical species and habitat recovery 	
Summary			
<p>Tentative Listing recognised potential OUV for biodiversity, but the case will need to be made providing evidence of integrity and that the scale of recovery and restoration efforts demonstrates that values are preserved and can be in perpetuity. Significant progress has been made, in establishing the</p>			

legal and management framework, along with progress towards restoration and recovery, supported by increase knowledge and growing local expertise, since the first nomination attempt failed in 1986. However, the OUV bar remains a challenge. The lack of any pristine habitat, the scale of remaining disturbed habitat, and species loss raise doubts amongst some experts consulted about the ability of the island to demonstrate OUV / integrity. Sustaining values depends on intensive intervention; a 'gardened' approach. Integrity is threatened by invasive species, climate change, development and the loss of wilderness experience due to encroachment of infrastructure development for tourism and development in open landscapes. Demonstrable conservation progress and achievements over the last 40 years should be celebrated and shared with the world. Building on collaborative effort and shared responsibility Peaks - And valuable political support both in St Helena and the UK should be cultivated to support St Helena's global biodiversity responsibilities and challenges for example the expanding conservation effort on the Peaks, notably the draft Peaks National Park Management Plan and plans to secure finances to support it evidence commitment and help to mitigate threats.

The 2011 nomination bid took a broad approach to OUV, covering the breadth of habitat and unique species, this does seem to present a stronger case for OUV than the original 1985 bid, however fundamentally the Peaks remain the key biodiversity area and the question of integrity still hangs over it. There is potential for the island to pursue a natural site. However, questions and uncertainty remain and it is considered that broadening the approach still further, with consideration of Marine OUV should be considered. A mixed bid, combining natural and cultural values is likely to make the strongest case. Consider a broader theme - East India Company Island.

Potential to argue for a wide definition to natural habitat – main sites holding many endemic species even if not totally natural should be treated as such. There is potential to broaden the scope of the Natural Bid, including consideration of marine biodiversity values and others, landscape & although not supported in 1986 – potential for (vii) for evolutionary values?

Stepping stones for natural heritage: Pursue proposed designation of Wetlands of International Importance for the St Helena Central Peaks & Fisher's Valley and St Helena inshore waters, stacks and cliffs) under the Ramsar Convention (<https://www.ukotcf.org.uk/ramsar-convention-on-wetlands>). Research to develop understanding of ecological relationships and ecosystem function. Completion of CMPs for remaining 12 NCAs, legal designation of NCAs, Strengthening of strategic and policy framework – under review of LDPC; establishment and implementation of a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, explore options for securing the resources to extend invasive species control and eradication programmes and restoration effort; establish means to improve enforcement of law.

Natural – Marine criteria (x)			
Strength	Weakness	Opportunity	Threat
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endemism & island evolution - geographical location and isolation/genetic isolation and uniqueness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertainty about & evidencing OUV – biodiversity values on a global perspective • Knowledge gaps in species status and ecology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holistic – land and sea/scapes connected - EIC • development of robust science 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism – levels of pressure in relation to tourism. Traditional fishing methods have been less invasive and support

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress since 2013 on marine biodiversity, identification, mapping, monitoring and conservation. Protection and management - legal framework for conservation (EPO, 2016) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Policies under review - BBP • Internationally recognised protected areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Marine Protected Area (Category vi sustainable use) ➤ KBAs • Management framework. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Marine Protected Area Plan (2016) currently under review – due April 2020 ➤ Blue Belt Programme • Integrity - functional habitats – MPA 200 nautical miles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Megafauna – whale sharks, devil rays, dolphins and humpback whales ➤ Missing piece of the world puzzle - 50:50 sex ratio of whale sharks – race to be first on the world map for mating record. ➤ Biodiversity hotspot between Long Ledge and Billy Mays and this has been proposed as a Marine Biological Reserve ➤ Examples of resilience and recovery - seabirds nesting on the mainland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Evidence of declining endemic corals ➤ Impact of invasive species • Managing threats – pollution, climate change, introduced species • Resources ➤ Capacity to work to prioritised programmes only – MMP linked to sustainable fisheries not at level of detail of conservation management • Policy gaps – sustainable fisheries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • whale share research Genetic isolation and uniqueness? (Alex Watts) • enhancement of quality of marine and coastal habitats • Sewage treatment • Plastic management -local & international • Blue Belt Programme – to be reviewed 2020 • Stepping stone - Ramsar for St Helena inshore waters, stacks and cliffs • World leader in sustainable fisheries – one by one, sustainable tourism – whale sharks 	<p>sustainable fisheries management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality - pollution • Climate change • Declining habitat quality • Encroachment of development within open landscapes (PBP)
---	---	---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local technical skills – conservation management • Social and political support – recognised social values – sustainable fisheries, one by one fishery, illustrative of Saint culture – resourcefulness, resilience, isolation driving sustainability of practise • Demonstrable commitment & achievements to preserving current status of marine environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Knowledge of marine biodiversity – surveys & inventories, mapping, monitoring ➤ Conservation and sustainable management - evolving science - ecology, (whale shark, fisheries (tuna species), lobster, storm petrel • Knowledge and management of threats • International support and commitment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ UK Government Blue Belt Programme ➤ IPNLF ➤ Georgia Aquarium 			
Summary			
Seek to establish the potential for OUV criteria for the Marine environment and consider including that as part of the Natural evidence			

Stepping stones for marine heritage - Recognition of biodiversity value with proposed Marine KBA. The Marine Inshore Area lies within St Helena's MPA. Boundaries for the proposed Ramsar (2006) were not well defined and the KBA could be considered to align with the proposed Ramsar site. Pursue proposed designation of Wetlands of International Importance for the St Helena inshore waters, stacks and cliffs under the Ramsar Convention (<https://www.ukotcf.org.uk/ramsar-convention-on-wetlands> . Implementation of the MPA Management Plan and development of sustainable fisheries and tourism

Develop understanding and management approaches for the coastal zone, where the marine and terrestrial environments meet, interact and influence one another.

Cultural – criteria ii, iii, iv, v and vi			
Strength	Weakness	Opportunity	Threat
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geographical location and isolation – Values and material remains of the Island’s history as a trading post and meeting place (east and west) • Potential for holistic, broad approach to WHS –connected land/seascape – Company Island • Demonstrable OUV <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ EIC wharf & Jamestown – from ‘Maldivia to the wharf’ the only complete eighteenth century, East India Company fortified port town left anywhere in the world. • Question of all or part – start in core area and expand <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Potential - Island fortifications –all part of the overall defensive system based on Jamestown– Lemon Valley, Mundens, Ladder Hill, High Knoll, Banks’ – strength in whole network, rather than individual fortifications – links history – defence and protection of trade and prisoner island ➢ History of slavery and trade/people movement with the Indian Ocean ➢ Liberation of Africans from transatlantic slave trade and role in the abolition of slavery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political will – managing immediate economic development pressures • Planning – administration of planning policy • Legal and policy framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ No CMP for Jamestown ➢ No design guidelines ➢ CMP’s not endorsed or referenced ➢ Outdated List of Historical structures – Crallan, 1976 • Heritage recognition and preservation at a local level – foundational awareness raising, skill development and resourcing • Skills to manage, conserve and preserve • Finances • State of preservation and conservation of physical remains 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing a National Heritage Strategy and implementation • Growing local and international recognition and appreciation of unique and historic values • Cooperation and partnerships need to be grown • Developing our knowledge base • Expanding understanding and growing a sense of pride and responsibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ District competitions ➢ Training & educational opportunities/career paths • Attracting international funding to restore heritage structures and social and economic activity around new use • Political lobbying potential for development plans • Reinternment of liberated African remains and commemoration and interpretation • World class tourism destination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Marketing – EIC Company Island ➢ Voluntourism – heritage • Growth of Heritage industry – mirroring development in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of authenticity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Development - wharf ➢ Lack of approved management plans ➢ Lack of protection despite planning policies • Uncertainty over planning - LDCCP under review • Lack of resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Skills ➢ Maintenance ➢ Financial • Climate change – sea level rises – Banks’ Battery, Lemon Valley, Sandy Bay

Cultural – criteria ii, iii, iv, v and vi			
Strength	Weakness	Opportunity	Threat
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Buildings associated with important aspects and events in world history/isolation driven innovation, resilience and resourcefulness in design, materials and craftsmanship (local vernacular) • Conservation Management Plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Wharf ➤ Lemon Valley ➤ High Knoll • Demonstrable commitment & achievements to preserving current status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Some management and intervention Lemon Valley and High Knoll • Social and political support – recognised social values – much greater awareness of the cultural importance of the history and the landscape - Airport Project/LAG, St Helena’s slave history, responsibility for reinternment and commemoration, Heritage Sub-Committee Report, • Legal framework for heritage conservation (LDCPO, 2012) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ LDCP policies under review 		<p>natural heritage conservation – management, design, construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stepping stones – National Heritage Strategy; International Recognition of St Helena’s role in the ending of the transatlantic slave trade. • World Monument Funding for African Burial Ground Rupert’s • FCO support 	

Cultural – criteria ii, iii, iv, v and vi			
Strength	Weakness	Opportunity	Threat
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical remains linked to history – liberated Africans, indentured labour International support and commitment 			
Summary			
<p>Need to understand obligations and restrictions, costs and benefits. Give further consideration to what cultural heritage elements could go forward Stepping stones for cultural heritage – Progress HER, completion, validation and endorsement, establish CMPs for the Wharf, Lemon Valley and High Knoll and implement, develop and implement CMPs for Jamestown and the remaining HCAs (Heritage Coast) that don't have them and secure legal designation of sites under LDCO (2012), heritage recognition and preservation at a local level – foundational awareness raising, capacity building and skill development and resourcing. Implementation of recommendations of the ENRC Heritage Sub-Committee and the establishment and implementation of a National Heritage Strategy, Securing funding for the memorialisation of the African Burial Grounds.</p>			

4. Gap Analysis

Whilst the Group's work did seek to identify and enumerate the potential benefits, costs, obligations and implications of any potential full application, this was not possible and further investigation is needed to ensure clarity and understanding. However, the Group was able to begin to outline the scope of work needed to address these points.

An early consideration is to understand the financial costs of undertaking research to fill the evident knowledge gaps; advice from the UK Government Advisors, Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC), English Heritage and other expert authorities to specify the scope of work needed to evidence OUV would be helpful, as would support in understanding how funding for the research might be secured.

Ecosystem integrity remains the most problematic issue to address. There remain knowledge gaps in fungi, soil biota and an understanding of the relationships between biodiversity (both native and non-native) and ecological health and function. More research will be needed to determine what level of evidence base the island would require in order to demonstrate ecosystem integrity and function.

One stepping stone which might help to progress matters would be Ramsar designation. Despite identification of potential to designate Wetlands of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention (2006), St Helena has not moved to achieve designation. The process is not complicated and could be achieved in relatively short time. National governments take a lead (i.e. UK, at the request of St Helena) to designate the site. It would be useful for the potential Ramsar sites to be reviewed, so that a decision could be taken by Government on whether and how to proceed in each case.

Given that more information is needed to make any decision on progressing to a full application or not, the Group had an obligation to stress-test the island's options in taking any full bid forward.

Guidance from DCMS and their preferred experts was sought. It is clear that the island's current Tentative Listing as a natural site does not give the freedom to make a cultural only full application. Additionally, the changes in local boundaries since the original application in 2011 would not provide a significant problem – a natural only application using the current boundaries would be seen as an appropriate full application. It is also evident that the feedback from the Panel in 2012 does leave the door open to further substantiate the cultural OUV of the island. The Group consider that any potential bid could be strengthened by utilising the invitation to re-establish the "Cultural" status, to combine with the "Natural", making a mixed site.

Where the situation lacks some clarity however is in the process and timing for adding cultural aspects to any full application. Should the island prepare to submit a mixed application, or should the updated full natural application be submitted, on the understanding that culture could be added later, or indeed reviewed as part of the technical evaluation process?

Guidance on this last point has been sought, but slightly different perspectives have been given by the relevant experts consulted. Whilst the Group has attempted to resolve this point by posing more questions, in the hope of having a final view to include in this Position Statement, the reality is that a definitive answer is unlikely to be provided until more work has been done on island.

Therefore, it would be beneficial to seek early agreement from DCMS that a technical evaluation could be prepared for a mixed site, on the basis that the Panel previously advised that the cultural aspects

could be explored further. This would help inform decisions about the basis on which any full application should be prepared, to confirm which of the following options is most likely to succeed:

- 1) Natural site based on original bid with updated boundary descriptions
- 2) Broader approach to natural site, bringing in other natural values (EIC Island)
- 3) Extend natural site to include marine biodiversity
- 4) Seek to extend to cultural values to proceed with a mixed site

Finally, a further key gap in knowledge relates to the specifics of any cultural application for listing that is included. In the event that the island wishes to progress to a full mixed application, it will be necessary to refine the options for cultural. The Group have highlighted the following three possibilities, but there may be other approaches:

- East India Company wharf and Jamestown
- Island fortifications “EIC landscape”
- Broader WHS taking in other elements of the EIC landscape – EIC island

In refining the approach that the island seeks to adopt, further work would be needed on the comparative study⁵ to show the international context of the proposal.

⁵ Annex 5: table of Comparative Sites

5. Recommendations for Next Steps

The Group's work of fact-finding around St Helena's potential OUV, and stress-testing of the options now available to the island, has not led to a complete understanding. However, the process has synthesised and collated the available information and knowledge; and, has established or re-kindled dialogue with experts and interested parties who are ready to provide support, as necessary.

The approach has also enabled an informed view of the most useful, practicable and appropriate next steps, to the extent that we are confident to make the following recommendations to St Helena Government.

- A community-led Steering Committee (the Committee) should be established. This should not be led by an existing body with a pre-determined agenda. It should be a wide group of key individuals who are able and willing to share the tasks and decisions required, and able to represent key stakeholders. The selection of the Steering Group should be done in consultation, considering recommendations and 'volunteers' who offer themselves up for selection. The Steering Group will need to consult widely on a range of important factors, so balance and wide representation is essential. Membership must be broad enough to establish a strong stakeholder partnership approach and embrace sustainable development at the core, with good communications, co-operation to ensure joined up planning and timely interventions and reporting (for example JMC Action Plan; SEDP and Sector Action Plans). The establishment of the Steering Group will demonstrate a breadth of understanding of the potential benefits and implications involved with the responsibilities of the Steering Group.
- The Committee should review the work of the Group to ensure they have a robust view of the findings, and the gaps that still exist.
- The Committee should make and retain contact with the experts consulted as part of this Group's work, as well as additional experts that they may identify; relationships with these experts should be further developed by the Steering Group so that the island can benefit from their expertise and cultivate ongoing support (voluntarily, where possible). and to aid decision-making.
- The Committee Group will need to understand the WHS process, identify key specialists and to start forming relationships including with English Heritage and JNCC, as the UK's official advisors, and the UK National Commission for UNESCO which has a broader remit as advisor to Government on all UNESCO-related matters. A range of other cultural and natural heritage bodies, including the national UK committees of IUCN and ICOMOS, contribute to this work.
- The Committee should devise a Brief for an Expert Consultant to work with them, with a view to providing answers to the gaps that exist; this should be a full exploration and analysis of the opportunities, obligations and implications of a successful full application for both natural and mixed designation, and an assessment of the levels of commitment and support of all key stakeholders to protect the site, as well as future resourcing and sustainable management. As a minimum this should include opportunities and obligations around preservation, conservation, planning, costs, social, economic and environmental benefits, resources needed, and any legislative, regulatory or management changes required for both options. In essence this would constitute evidence of the viability of proceeding to a full nomination and upon which a decision can be taken on whether and how best to proceed.
- The Committee should take advice on how the feasibility work may be funded (although early indications to the Group have been that World Heritage Status may be an area of interest for the Foreign & Commonwealth Office, as well as DCMS)

- The Island's position on the Tentative List, has not been widely publicised locally and is not well known. The Committee will need to consider how to communicate with the public, stakeholders and decision-makers to best effect.

Annexes:

- Annex 1 Scoping Group: Terms of Reference
- Annex 2 The full list of criteria
- Annex 3 A copy of the 2011 nomination
- Annex 4 Site Map
- Annex 5 Site Comparison
- Annex 6 Presentation held at Expert meeting
- Annex 7 Facts Finding and Observations
- Annex 8 Document and Email Index
- Annex 9 Contacts
- Annex 10 Draft terms of Reference for the Committee