IUCN Conservation Outlook Assessment 2014 **(archived)**
Finalised on 06 November 2014

Please note: this is an archived Conservation Outlook Assessment for Kilimanjaro National Park. To access the most up-to-date Conservation Outlook Assessment for this site, please visit https://www.worldheritageoutlook.iucn.org.

Kilimanjaro National Park

SITE INFORMATION

Country:
Tanzania (United Republic of)
Inscribed in: 1987
Criteria:
(vii)

Site description:
At 5,895 m, Kilimanjaro is the highest point in Africa. This volcanic massif stands in splendid isolation above the surrounding plains, with its snowy peak looming over the savannah. The mountain is encircled by mountain forest. Numerous mammals, many of them endangered species, live in the park. © UNESCO

SUMMARY

2014 Conservation Outlook

Good with some concerns

The World Heritage property occupies the higher elevation parts of the Kilimanjaro National Park (above the tree line at 2,700 m). It is an area that is ‘buffered’ from the intensively cultivated lower slopes of the mountain by a wide belt of protected forest (formerly forest reserve but incorporated into the National Park since 2005). This ensures that the World Heritage site remains remote, inaccessible and relatively unaffected by human activities. The most significant threat to its scenic value (for which it was inscribed) is climate change. The mountain’s glaciers are melting fast, and are expected to disappear altogether within a couple of decades. Furthermore, the characteristic altitudinal zonation of vegetation communities will inevitably shift in the medium-to-long term as the climate warms. Maintaining the site’s values will require long-term protection of the entire ecosystem, as the ecological resilience of the property and its ability to adapt to a warmer climate, will require landscape connectivity with adjacent mid-elevation forests and other habitats at lower altitudes.

Current state and trend of VALUES

Low Concern
Trend: Deteriorating

The scenic values of the site, which are intimately linked to the occurrence of glaciers and snowfields close to the Equator, are being compromised as the ice melts. The glaciers are expected to disappear altogether from Kilimanjaro within a couple of decades, possibly as soon as 2015-2020. A four-fold increase in visitor numbers since the property was listed is creating the demand for further infrastructure and problems associated with litter and sanitation, all of which diminishes the outstanding natural beauty of the place.

Overall THREATS

Low Threat

The property’s remote and rugged geography, combined with its very limited potential for alternative use means it is not highly threatened. Climate change is melting the glaciers (which are expected to disappear altogether within a couple of decades), and will alter vegetation communities in the long term. Wild fires occur annually and are sometimes difficult to bring under control, causing extensive damage to the natural vegetation. There is a limited amount of illegal hunting and collection of some minor forest products, but there are no data to indicate whether this is within sustainable limits, and it mainly affects the forested areas of the park (outside the property). Tourism pressures are high and increasing, creating associated problems with litter, waste management and trampling of vegetation.

Overall PROTECTION and MANAGEMENT

Mostly Effective

The remote location and rugged terrain of the property ensures a high degree of natural protection against unsustainable resource use, limiting the need for management intervention. There is a good current management plan, but little recent information on the level of its implementation. The development of a comprehensive management plan that considers the World Heritage property in a wider ecosystem context will facilitate further required action to mitigate the effects of climate change.

FULL ASSESSMENT

Description of values

Values

World Heritage values

- **Africa’s highest peak in and one of the world’s largest free-standing mountains**
  Criterion:(vii)

  Kilimanjaro is not only the highest mountain in Africa, but also one of the largest volcanoes in the world (IUCN evaluation, 1987; UNEP-WCMC, 2012; SoOUV, 2010). It stands isolated on the surrounding plains of East Africa, rising 4,877 m above the plains so that its summit attains an elevation of 5,895 m asl. Its massive bulk covers a land area of almost 4,000 km2 (SoOUV, 2010)

- **Spectacular mountain scenery**
  Criterion:(vii)

  The property includes some of Africa’s most spectacular mountain scenery, including Africa’s highest point (Uhuru Peak, 5,895m), remnant glaciers, and a number of lakes, waterfalls and bog-filled valleys. It is a relatively young extinct volcano, with three main peaks, Kibo, Mawenzi and Shira (SoOUV, 2010). The central area of the youngest peak (Kibo) consists of two concentric craters with a 350m-deep ash pit in the centre and some spectacular ice fields and glaciers around the rim.

Other important biodiversity values

► Rare and endemic species

By comparison with Africa's other high mountains, Kilimanjaro is relatively species-poor on account of its recent origins (450-750,000 years) and comparatively dry climate. However, its biodiversity values are nevertheless important. The whole mountain including the montane forest belt is very rich in species, in particular mammals, many of them endangered species (SoOUV, 2010). Kilimanjaro is part of the Kenyan Mountains Endemic Bird Area (EBA), and a Birdlife Important Bird Area (IBA) (Baker, 2002). It supports four species of bird that are considered globally Vulnerable and two species that are near-threatened, as well as three of the restricted-range species of the Kenyan Mountains EBA. The World Heritage property does not cover any of the forested habitats where most of the mammal, bird and plant biodiversity is concentrated but it does include the more unique ecological communities of the heaths, moorlands and high-altitude deserts. These areas support some notable endemic species including the giant groundsel, Dendrosenecio kilimanjari, and the giant Lobelia deckenii.

Assessment information

Threats

Current Threats

Low Threat

The biggest long-term threat is climate change which is expected to cause the disappearance of the glaciers within a few decades, and result in a general shift in vegetation zones to higher elevations. Importantly, this is likely to reduce the area of the unique Afro-alpine communities. Uncontrolled fire is a frequent threat during drier periods, destroying extensive areas of forest and heath. The property covers the upper reaches of the mountain above the tree-line, so threats to the forest cover on the mid-level and lower slopes has an indirect affect on the property. There is a limited amount of illegal hunting and

collection of some minor forest products, but there are no data to indicate whether this is within sustainable limits, and it mainly affects the forested areas of the park (outside the property). Tourism pressures are high and increasing, creating associated problems with litter, waste management and trampling of vegetation

► Other Ecosystem Modifications

Low Threat
Inside site
Outside site

The property is ‘buffered’ from adjacent settlements by a 5-10 km wide belt of protected natural forest and plantations, but the land beyond the lower boundary of the park (at about 1,800 m) is becoming more intensively settled and cultivated, eliminating previous landscape connectivity with nearby natural habitats, especially to the west (Arusha National Park) and north-west (Amboseli National Park, Kenya). Thus historical migration routes of keystone species, such as elephants, are being lost (UNESCO Periodic Reporting, 2001).

► Habitat Shifting/ Alteration, Temperature changes

High Threat
Inside site
Outside site

Global warming is raising temperatures and melting the park’s glaciers. The volume of glacial ice is now 80% less than it was a century ago (Wikipedia, 2012) and the glaciers are expected to disappear altogether within the next couple of decades, possibly as early as 2015-20 (Thompson et al., 2002). Climate change is likely to cause a general shift of vegetation zones to higher elevations reducing the area of the rare high-altitude Afro-alpine vegetation communities. There may also be an increased incidence of landslides and flash- flooding if precipitation falls as rain instead of snow.

► Commercial hunting

Low Threat
Outside site

Subsistence and commercial hunting is carried out in the forested lower slopes (GMP, 2005), and to a lesser extent at higher elevations where its

impact is limited due to the extremely rugged terrain and difficulty of capturing prey species (SP SOC Report, 2009).

► Fire/ Fire Suppression

High Threat
Inside site
Outside site

Wild fires are a major problem and most are started by people (GMP, 2005). This may be intentional, for example when fire is used by poachers, cattle herders or honey gatherers, or accidental (e.g. in the case of visitor camp fires). The unnaturally frequent fires are likely to be having an adverse effect on natural community dynamics, particularly in the heath zones where fires are most extensive, but there is currently little understanding of the effects of fire (GMP, 2005)

► Logging/ Wood Harvesting

Low Threat
Outside site

The forested slopes at elevations below about 1,800 m (which lie outside the world heritage property and below the lower boundary of the (extended) National Park) are under increasingly-intensive cultivation, thus reducing the functioning and ecological resilience of the entire ecosystem. Deforestation of the lower slopes is thought to be partially responsible for the retreat of the glaciers, by reducing the flow of moisture up the mountainside and depleting the mountain’s icy hood (Pepin et al., 2010).

► Tourism/ visitors/ recreation

Low Threat
Inside site
Outside site

With some 40-42,000 visitors annually (for the period 2006-8, SP SOC Report, 2009), tourism creates a number of problems related to litter and waste management; erosion of paths and trampling of vegetation (EoH Report, 2012).

► Invasive Non-Native/ Alien Species

Data Deficient

Inside site

There are indications that invasive exotic plants are present, but the extent of the threat is unknown (UNESCO Periodic Reporting; EoH Report, 2012)

Potential Threats

Protection and management

Assessing Protection and Management

► Relationships with local people

Data Deficient

Community relations are generally good in respect of the World Heritage property, with the economic benefits of tourism accruing to local people who provide porter and guiding services. The World Heritage property is currently limited to the upper reaches of the mountain (above 2,700 m) so there is a wide swathe of protected forest land between it and the areas of farming settlement below the National Park boundary (at around the 1,800 m contour). Community Outreach is one of the four main programmes detailed in the General Management Plan (GMP, 2005-15), and the intention to scale-up conservation education and improve park-community communication are stated management objectives. The GMP also identifies a need to re-invigorate support for community-initiated projects, focusing on conservation-friendly income-generating activities, mitigation of human-wildlife conflicts and supporting resource management activities in the buffer zones. No information is available on the extent of implementation of this community outreach programme.

► Legal framework and enforcement

Mostly Effective

The legal framework is fairly strong. Originally protected as a Forest Reserve in 1921 the uppermost section of the mountain, together with six corridors down to lower elevations (totaling 753 km2, mostly above the 2,700m contour) became a National Park in 1973 (SoOUV, 2010). This was extended

in 2005 to include the remaining natural forest down to the 1,800 m contour, adding a further 926 km2 to the Park. The national park is managed by the semi-autonomous Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA) with its own Board of Trustees and financial sustainability is based on full revenue retention. The SP identifies low levels of penalties and ineffective implementation of wildlife laws outside the park as significant limitations (SP SOC Report, 2009).

► Integration into regional and national planning systems

Mostly Effective

The property is managed by TANAPA as one of Tanzania's 14 National Parks. Its management is carried out in accordance with TANAPA's new national-level strategic planning processes and integrated with regional systems through the involvement of district government, local communities and a wide range of other stakeholders in planning at the site level (GMP, 2005-15)

► Management system

Mostly Effective

The first comprehensive management plan of Kilimanjaro National Park (the World Heritage property covers 40% of the park) was approved in May 1993 (GMP, 1993). This was replaced with a new one in 2005, following extension of the park to include the forested slopes of the mountain, which more than doubled its size (GMP, 2005-15). The present GMP establishes High- and Low-Use Hiking Zones (comprising about 17% of the park's area), with the remainder of the park (83%) designated as a Wilderness Zone. Management is structured around four major programmes, each aligned to one of the park's departments, and dealing with (1) Ecosytem Management, (2) Tourism Management, (3) Community Outreach and (4) Park Operations.

► Management effectiveness

Some Concern

Management is significantly constrained by budgetary and staffing levels (SP SOC Report, 2009). In 2008/9 the park's annual operating budget was US$ 2.7million and it had a staff of 185 full-time employees (SP SOC Report, 2009). There is an identified need for almost 300 staff. Despite these inadequacies, however, the World Heritage property (covering about 40% of

the park, at higher elevations) is characteristically resilient and requires only relatively low levels of management input to retain its values and ecological integrity.

► Implementation of Committee decisions and recommendations

Data Deficient

There have been no committee decisions or recommendations requiring implementation since the property was listed in 1987

► Boundaries

Some Concern

The World Heritage property is not demarcated, its boundary following approximately the 2,700m contour, within the Kilimanjaro National Park. The lower boundary of the National Park (following its extension in 2005) is partially demarcated at around 1,800m, providing protection for natural forest on the mountain’s mid-level slopes, below the property (which serve as a de facto buffer zone). There is scope to extend the property to include some of the lower elevation forested slopes in order to enhance protection of animal migration corridors and improve ecological resilience to climate change.

► Sustainable finance

Mostly Effective

TANAPA is a self-financing semi-autonomous agency so revenue generated from tourism is retained and re-invested in park management. Kilimanjaro has been financially self-sustaining since 1984 (UNEP-WCMC, 2012), and currently generates a substantial surplus which is used to cross-subsidise other aspects of TANAPA operations, including the less profitable elements in the park network. There remain significant unmet management needs and concerns over sustainable financing at all parks, including Kilimanjaro (SP SOC Report, 2009).

► Staff training and development

Some Concern

Present staffing levels are considered to be inadequate (SP SOC Report,

2009), but no plan for staff development was available for this assessment. In 2008/9 the park had a staff of 185 full-time employees (SP SOC Report, 2009). There is an identified need for almost 300 staff. The level of training of existing staff is assessed as ‘Good’ for 9 categories of staff, ‘Fair’ for 5 categories (technicians, secretaries, drivers, rangers and office assistants) and ‘Poor’ for one category (park assistants) (SP SOC Report, 2009).

► Sustainable use

Mostly Effective

There is no consumptive use of resources allowed within the property or parts of the park beyond its boundaries on the forested mid-slopes. However, under the GMP, Wildlife Management Areas are supported in communal areas beyond the park boundary in order to ensure sustainable use of resources and protect wildlife that moves between these areas and the park (GMP, 2005-15)

► Education and interpretation programs

Data Deficient

Community Outreach is one of the four core programmes described in the 2005-15 management plan (GMP, 2005), and scaling up the conservation education programme is one of its main objectives. Eight specific actions are identified, but there is no recent information on the extent to which these have been implemented.

► Tourism and interpretation

Some Concern

Tourism Management is one of the four core programmes described in the 2005-15 management plan (GMP, 2005). The most recent visitor statistics show that 40-42,000 visitors were reported annually for the years 2006-8, up from around 21,000 in 2000 (SP SOC report, 2009), and 12,000 in 1991 (GMP, 1993). Existing park interpretation facilities are rudimentary, but the GMP envisages development of a new visitor centre at the Marangu park headquarters and ‘mini-interpretation’ sites at selected locations elsewhere. The GMP provides for further upgrading of visitor facilities, concentrating on upgrading water supplies, sanitation and providing accommodation to suit

local (Tanzanian) visitors.

► Monitoring

Data Deficient

The park's ten-year GMP (2005-15) is based on a 'Logical Framework Approach' that allows for easy development of three-year action plans and annual operations plans that can be readily monitored and evaluated, thereby facilitating adaptive management. There is no information on the success of this new approach to planning at the park. Under the GMP's Ecosystem Management Programme, an Ecological Monitoring Plan was to be formulated, focusing on five specific 'conservation targets', namely (1) the elephant population, (2) mammalian biodiversity, (3) eco-climatic zones, (4) glaciers and (5) water and catchment values. This plan was not available for the current assessment, nor was there any further information on its implementation.

► Research

Mostly Effective

The property does not have a comprehensive research programme, but there are a number of externally-supported long-term research activities including research on vegetation (University of Bayreuth, Germany), elephants of west Kilimanjaro (African Wildlife Foundation) and glacial ice (University of Ohio) (SP SOC Report, 2009).

Overall assessment of protection and management

Mostly Effective

The remote location and rugged terrain of the property ensures a high degree of natural protection against unsustainable resource use, limiting the need for management intervention. There is a good current management plan, but little recent information on the level of its implementation. The development of a comprehensive management plan that considers the World Heritage property in a wider ecosystem context will facilitate further required action to mitigate the effects of climate change.

▶ **Assessment of the effectiveness of protection and management in addressing threats outside the site**
Data Deficient

The extension of the park in 2005 is enabling improved protection and restoration of forest on the mid-slopes of the mountain. Coupled with efforts to protect vegetation cover and support sustainable use of resources by adjacent communities, this is likely to be reducing threats from outside the site.

State and trend of values

Assessing the current state and trend of values

World Heritage values

▶ **Africa’s highest peak in and one of the world’s largest free-standing mountains**
Good
Trend:Stable

The last major period of volcanic activity was 450,000 years ago (Stewart, 2004), and its status as Africa’s highest peak is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future

▶ **Spectacular mountain scenery**
Low Concern
Trend:Deteriorating

For many visitors a significant element in the scenic values of Kilimanjaro is the existence of glaciers and snowfields close to the equator. Their disappearance will reduce the scenic value and impact of the property. Furthermore, as visitor numbers increase there will be a need for further infrastructure, including visitor accommodation, campsites, trails, toilets etc which will compromise the scenic values of the property

Other important biodiversity values

► Rare and endemic species

By comparison with Africa’s other high mountains, Kilimanjaro is relatively species-poor on account of its recent origins (450-750,000 years) and comparatively dry climate. However, its biodiversity values are nevertheless important. The whole mountain including the montane forest belt is very rich in species, in particular mammals, many of them endangered species (SoOUV, 2010). Kilimanjaro is part of the Kenyan Mountains Endemic Bird Area (EBA), and a Birdlife Important Bird Area (IBA) (Baker, 2002). It supports four species of bird that are considered globally Vulnerable and two species that are near-threatened, as well as three of the restricted-range species of the Kenyan Mountains EBA. The World Heritage property does not cover any of the forested habitats where most of the mammal, bird and plant biodiversity is concentrated but it does include the more unique ecological communities of the heaths, moorlands and high-altitude deserts. These areas support some notable endemic species including the giant groundsel, Dendrosenecio kilimanjari, and the giant Lobelia deckenii.

Summary of the Values

► Assessment of the current state and trend of World Heritage values

Low Concern

Trend: Deteriorating

The scenic values of the site, which are intimately linked to the occurrence of glaciers and snowfields close to the Equator, are being compromised as the ice melts. The glaciers are expected to disappear altogether from Kilimanjaro within a couple of decades, possibly as soon as 2015-2020. A four-fold increase in visitor numbers since the property was listed is creating the demand for further infrastructure and problems associated with litter and sanitation, all of which diminishes the outstanding natural beauty of the place.

► Assessment of the current state and trend of other important

biodiversity values

Data Deficient

Trend: Data Deficient

The biodiversity values of the property are likely to be responding to (1) climate change and (2) improvements in the protection of habitat in the forested ‘buffer zone’. However, there is no information or monitoring data to substantiate this.

Additional information

Key conservation issues

▶ Undertake IUCN/UNESCO monitoring mission

Global

Undertake a IUCN/UNESCO monitoring mission to provide independent appraisal of current State of Conservation of the site (EoH, 2012)

▶ Fire control and management

Local

Develop and implement a fire response strategy

▶ Strengthen monitoring to inform adaptive management approaches

Local

Undertake a comprehensive resource inventory to establish baseline data and implement a long-term monitoring programme to evaluate the impact of management interventions, and ecological change resulting from climate change and other factors

▶ Improve community relations

Local

Further strengthen community relations especially towards mutually beneficial management arrangements

► Minimizing human-wildlife conflict

Local

Consider the need for fencing of the lower boundary of the National Park so as to minimize damage by wildlife to crops, forestry plantations and domestic livestock in neighbouring areas

► Improve tourism facilities, management and visitor interpretation

Local

Improve visitor facilities including toilet and sanitation facilities, waste disposal and management, water supplies, camp sites and accommodation facilities and visitor interpretation (EoH Report, 2012)

► Buffer Zone Definition

Regional

Define a buffer zone, and strengthen its management with the aim of restoring the ecological integrity of natural forest areas at lower elevations (beyond the National Park boundaries) and ensuring the protection of animal migration corridors and connectivity of natural habitats to lower elevations and adjoining protected areas (e.g. Amboseli National Park)

► Extend the property to lower elevations

National

Extend the property to include the natural forest that was incorporated into the Kilimanjaro National Park in 2005, thereby strengthening protection of animal migration corridors and increasing the ability of the property to adapt to climate change and other factors

► Strengthen management

National

Increase staffing and budget support so as to more effectively patrol and manage the property. Training of rangers is identified as a particular need (EoH Report, 2012)

Benefits

Understanding Benefits

► Water provision (importance for water quantity and quality)

Mount Kilimanjaro serves an invaluable role as a water catchment, maintaining biodiversity and life-support systems downstream, as well as economically important hydro-electric facilities and irrigation schemes.

Projects

Compilation of active conservation projects

№	Organization/ individuals	Project duration	Brief description of Active Projects
1	Data deficient		Data deficient

REFERENCES

№	References
1	Baker, N & E (2002). Important Bird Areas in Tanzania. Wildlife Conservation Society of Tanzania
2	EoH Report (2012). Final Report on the Enhancing Our Heritage project for Kilimanjaro National Park. PAMS Foundation
3	GMP 2005-15. Kilimanjaro National Park General Management Plan
4	GMP, 1993. Kilimanjaro National Park General Management Plan. TANAPA
5	IUCN Evaluation (1987).
6	Pepin, N.C., Duane, W.J., Hardy, D.R. (2010). The montane circulation on Kilimanjaro, Tanzania and its relevance for the summit ice fields: Comparison of surface mountain climate with equivalent reanalysis parameters. Global and Planetyry Change, Vol. 74, Issue 2.
7	SoOUV. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, UNESCO website (2012)
8	State Party State Of Conservation Report, March 2009
9	Stewart, A. (2004). Kilimanjaro. A complete Trekker’s Guide. Cicerone, Cumbria (UK)
10	Thompson et al., (2002). Abstract downloaded at: http://www.sciencemag.org/content/298/5593/589
11	UNEP-WCMC, 2012. World Heritage Site Fact Sheet
12	UNESCO Periodic Reporting (undated, downloaded 30 October 2012)