IUCN Conservation Outlook Assessment 2017 **(archived)**
Finalised on 09 November 2017

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

Manú National Park

SITE INFORMATION

Country:
Peru
Inscribed in: 1987
Criteria:
(ix) (x)

Site description:

This huge 1.5 million-ha park has successive tiers of vegetation rising from 150 to 4,200 m above sea-level. The tropical forest in the lower tiers is home to an unrivalled variety of animal and plant species. Some 850 species of birds have been identified and rare species such as the giant otter and the giant armadillo also find refuge there. Jaguars are often sighted in the park. © UNESCO

SUMMARY

2017 Conservation Outlook

Significant concern

Manu National Park benefits from its privileged location and size, as well as almost half a century of uninterrupted commitment by dedicated governmental staff, non-governmental organizations and Peruvian and international researchers. Many observers plausibly argue that the hostile and in some cases deadly indigenous responses to intrusions have likewise discouraged illegal access in remote areas and thus contributed to maintaining an exceptional state of conservation. The acute and direct threats to the property continue to be modest by the standards of most protected areas. Likewise, the management effort and effectiveness in the national park is by no means alarming. At the same time, the land and resource use dynamics have dramatically changed since the creation of the national park and the more recent World Heritage inscription. A quickly advancing development frontier has changed large tracts of a previously remote landscape. Major road infrastructure has been facilitating access and legal and illegal natural resource extraction. This development represents significant threats to the property in the medium and long terms, the effects of which are starting to become visible and are likely to be aggravated by anticipated climate change. There is an ever more urgent need to balance the inevitable trade-offs between economic development and social, cultural and environmental objectives. The numerous protected areas which are still functionally connected across vast territories and across boundaries with neighboring countries need to be better understood and maintained. This may well constitute one of the only available instruments to increase resilience and to reduce vulnerability to anticipated climate change in the long term. It is also the only chance for the cultural survival of some of the last completely self-sufficient forest-dwelling peoples in the world. It is for these imminent threats and the absence of an adequate response and preparedness that the outlook is overshadowed by significant concerns, only seemingly in contradiction to the still exceptionally high integrity.

Current state and trend of VALUES

Low Concern
Trend: Deteriorating

While the current state of World Heritage Values is very good, future threats from major changes in the broader region, expected climate change and the increasing human footprint in and around the Property combine to give a high level of concern. The social, cultural and environmental consequences of ongoing development schemes, including oil and gas, road infrastructure and logging need to be better understood and considered in regional and sector planning. Connectivity with other protected areas in the region should be considered in such planning.

Overall THREATS

High Threat

There are serious concerns about multiple developments outside the property, including road infrastructure development and resource exploration and extraction. Combined with the overarching concern about anticipated climate change, the impacts of increasing direct and indirect human pressure on the property and its surroundings are the foundation for an overall assessment of “high threat” - despite a still very good state of conservation.

Overall PROTECTION and MANAGEMENT

Some Concern

Despite challenges in terms of human and financial resources, park management has been effective in maintaining a very good state of conservation throughout the vast majority of the property. While this is partially a function of the scale, remoteness and terrain of the property it is also a function of the strong dedication of leadership and staff under at times adverse conditions. Reliable long-term funding is needed to adequately address the threats within and around the property.

FULL ASSESSMENT

Description of values

Values

World Heritage values

► **Enormous altitudinal gradient and mosaic of highly diverse ecosystems and habitats**
Criterion:(ix)

This roadless 1.7 million hectare property is located at the meeting point of the eastern slope of the Tropical Andes and the Amazon Basin. The property spans an enormous range of elevations, micro-climates and other ecological conditions, thereby enabling a wealth of highly diverse ecosystems, habitats and niches. The most widespread vegetation types found are tropical lowland rainforest down to some 350 m.a.s.l., different types of tropical montane rainforest and cloud forest (SoOUV). The highest elevations exceeding 4,000 m.a.s.l. boast treeless Puna, one of the native grassland types of the High Andes.

► **Exceptional biological diversity and rare, endemic and endangered species**
Criterion:(x)

The biological diversity of Manu National Park is among the highest recorded anywhere on Earth. Some 1024 bird species found in the property represent approximately 10% of the known global bird species diversity in a single protected area (1005 along one transect according to Patterson et al., 2006). The at least 222 mammal species include the charismatic Jaguar (Panthera onca), Puma (Puma concolor) and several other felids, such as the elusive and endangered Andean Cat (Leopardus jacobita). Many of the 14 primate

species (Patterson et al., 2016) are a common sight, and even the globally endangered Giant Otter (Pteronura brasiliensis) can often be seen in the countless oxbow lakes of major rivers. Manu is home to at least 155 species of amphibians and 132 species of reptiles, 2.2% and 1.5% respectively of the known diversity for these groups (Catenazzi et al., 2013). Numbers of invertebrates range in the hundreds of thousands with 1,300 recorded butterfly species alone (WDPA Data Sheet, 2011). The region may boast some 15,000 species of plants; Foster (1985) recorded almost 1,500 vascular plants just around the Cocha Cashu research station. Scientific expeditions in and around the property routinely lead to the discovery of new species across many taxonomic groups, including vertebrate and tree species (see for example Vriesendorp et al., 2004). In addition to the extraordinary diversity of life forms, the property is also renowned for its high level of endemism and an unusually high abundance and biomass of fauna across many taxonomic groups.

► **Exceptionally high degree of naturalness and integrity**
Criteria:(ix)(x)

Manu National Park is difficult and costly to access to this day due to its unusual geographical isolation, a key factor also in its historic economic isolation. It is one of very few protected areas in the world which completely encompasses a large and in essence undisturbed watershed of an important river. The coincidence of the park boundaries with a major ecological and geographic unit, the remoteness and Manu's contiguity with other vast areas of global conservation importance - all the way to and beyond the Brazilian border to the east for example - strongly contribute to the maintenance of ongoing ecological and evolutionary processes at a large scale. The full range of large top predators occurring in natural population densities is one indicator for the property's exceptional high degree of naturalness and integrity.

Other important biodiversity values

► **Ongoing interaction between indigenous peoples and biodiversity**

The national park and some of its surroundings are home to several

indigenous peoples in so-called initial contact and/or voluntary isolation. While some today engage in a mostly sedentary lifestyle combining agriculture, husbandry and hunting and gathering, the property enables the cultural survival of some of the last mobile indigenous peoples in the Americas. If one defines human beings as integral elements of biodiversity, Manu stands out as being among the last places where human beings have been using nature and biodiversity without fundamentally modifying it.

Assessment information

Threats

Current Threats

Low Threat

At a time when the property itself continues to be in a remarkably good state of conservation, the land and resource use dynamics of the broader landscape have been changing considerably over the last years and decades. On the one hand numerous protected areas have been created over the years and there is an increasing consensus on the need for more systematic conservation planning taking into account landscape connectivity. Likewise, there is an increasing number of indigenous areas which many hope will serve as a mechanism to avoid excessive resource exploitation. On the other hand, economic interests competing with nature conservation and sustainable use are increasingly putting pressure on the property. While the tangible effects of climate change and the slowly growing indigenous communities inside the property are no acute reasons for concern, it will be of critical importance to protect the park from the many faces of the encroaching development frontier.

▶ **Poaching**

Low Threat
Inside site, localised(<5%)

Poaching along the northwest border and subsistence hunting is common in and around the native communities. The current off-take by the Matsigenka

appears to be sustainable. Subsistence hunting was found to not result in prey depletion (Shepard et al. 2010., Ohl-Schacherer et al. 2007, Yu et al. 2013).

► Livestock Farming / Grazing

Low Threat
Inside site, localised(<5%)

While livestock grazing and associated use of fire is an ancient land use in the Andean grasslands, there is concern that levels may exceed sustainable use thereby damaging soils, productivity and conservation values.

► Temperature extremes

Data Deficient
Inside site, throughout(>50%)
Outside site

Climate change is already assumed to affect the property. However, no detailed evaluation is available.

► Mining/ Quarrying

Low Threat
Outside site

Deforestation for gold mining is encroaching on the buffer zones around the park to the point that it can easily be spotted on readily available satellite images. Taking into account the known impacts of unregulated gold mining elsewhere in the Peruvian Madre de Dios region, it is clear that an expansion of active mining would be devastating.

► Crops

Low Threat
Inside site, localised(<5%)
Outside site

Agricultural activities within the property are localized and restricted to subsistence levels. Localized swidden agriculture is slowly expanding around the indigenous communities Tayacome and Yomybato. Small-scale commercial and subsistence agriculture is widespread and indispensable for local communities in the buffer zone. There is some concern about

encroachment from the buffer zone to the south of the property, especially as improved road access would undoubtedly create incentives for commercial activities. The most sensitive agricultural activities is the cultivation of illicit crops, which has been confirmed for several years by the UN’s Office on Drugs and Crime (The Guardian, 2017).

► Tourism/ visitors/ recreation

Very Low Threat
Inside site, localised(<5%)
Outside site

The overall impact is minor, as visitation is extremely localized and the number of visitors is relatively small (between 2,000 and 3.000 visitors per year). Many tourism packages under the label "Manu" refer to areas outside of the national park which are easier to access from Cusco, the principal access.

► Mining/ Quarrying, Logging/ Wood Harvesting, Roads/ Railroads

High Threat
Outside site

The exceptional integrity of Manu National Park is a function of its location and size but also supported by a much larger surrounding landscape of highest conservation importance. Even though vast areas are today recognized as different categories of protected areas and indigenous communal areas (including the contiguous Alto Purus National Park which is even larger than Manu), illegal logging and mining are known to occur. Major roads connecting Brazil to the Pacific through the Andes are expected to change the regional economy and increase development pressure and resource extraction (Dourojeanni et al., 2009). Proposals to build a new access road along the southern boundary come and go. If eventually connected to Puerto Maldonado, this is likely to change the dynamics of the buffer zone which today can only be accessed via a precarious dirt road across the Andes (see Gallice et al. 2017 for a discussion of predictable impacts). Gas and oil exploration and extraction in the vicinity of the park have resulted in well-documented environmental impacts and are widely assumed to also affect indigenous peoples in so-called voluntary isolation (The Guardian, 2017).

Potential Threats

High Threat

The rapid growth of both legal and illegal resource extraction and infrastructure development outside the property is moving ever closer to the boundaries of the property. The recent and ongoing investment in road infrastructure in the Peruvian Amazon can be expected to further result is already visible economic, social and environmental changes in the broader region. Anticipated climate change is likely to add to the vulnerability of the ecosystem.

► Oil/ Gas exploration/development

High Threat
Outside site

Oil and gas exploration is occurring south of the property. The controversial Camisea Gas Field, one of Peru's largest energy projects, is located in a remote area in the immediate vicinity of the property. Interest in a possible expansion despite national park and World Heritage status has repeatedly been expressed and would obviously come with major risks for the property. It is assumed that indigenous groups in voluntary isolation have moved into Manu National Park (Yu et al. 2013) in response to disturbance by gas extraction.

► Temperature extremes

High Threat
Inside site, extent of threat not known
Outside site

While climate change is already believed to affect the Park, its future effects are predicted to be even more severe. Some observers anticipate important die-off of lowland forest, expecting such forests to give way to drier ecosystems. Impacts on freshwater systems and other consequences are expected.

► Crops

Low Threat
Inside site, throughout(>50%)

Outside site

Increasing human populations around the property, illegal logging and reported coca plantations, improved road access to the southern buffer zone, and hydrocarbon exploration in the buffer zone are driving the agricultural frontier towards the property. Though not an immediate threat, these trends are opening the door for future threats. Terborgh (1999) provided a sobering account of decades of personal work experience in this part of the Peruvian Amazon.

Protection and management

Assessing Protection and Management

► Relationships with local people

Some Concern

A Management Committee for the national park has been resuscitated after years of neglect, and includes major stakeholders and rights-holders. Relationships with local people are generally weak, however, because of limited staff and budgets. The situation is improving, but due to the lack of resources and staff the progress is slow (Manu SPreport, 2011; Parkwatch Profile, 2009; IUCN Consultation, 2013). The location of the Head Office in Cusco means that senior staff is not permanently present in the property or its buffer zone. See Huertas et al. (2003) and PRO-MANU/INRENA (2003) for useful overviews of the indigenous past, present and future of the park and broader region.

► Legal framework

Mostly Effective

The national park was given full legal protection through Supreme Decree in 1973 and enlarged in 2002. The management of the national park is assigned to the National Protected Areas Service (SERNANP).

► Enforcement

Some Concern

Law enforcement benefits from the remoteness and difficult access, mostly restricted to the Manu River itself and comparatively accessible areas near and above the treeline in the Andes. There are localized challenges, which include some farming and husbandry in the higher elevations and the alleged cultivation of illicit crops. Overall, law enforcement is functional.

► Integration into regional and national planning systems

Serious Concern

Given that the future integrity of Manu National Park to a large degree will depend on sectors other than conservation, there is an urgent need to better integrate conservation concerns into policies for infrastructure development, agriculture and resource extraction. Speaking strictly in conservation terms, there are encouraging efforts to establish conservation corridors to link the property with other protected areas, many of which are likewise of exceptional conservation significance. There is also major potential to take advantage of shared interests between conservation actors and indigenous peoples.

► Management system

Mostly Effective

The governmental management is led by the federal protected area agency SERNANP represented by its unit based in Cusco. Following up on consecutive earlier management plans, the current plan covers the period from 2013 to 2018 (Plan Maestro, SERNANP, 2013a). It is noteworthy that this Master Plan was underpinned by an extensive participatory process resulting in a separately published assessment (SERNANP, 2013b). The plan continues to contain and refine descriptive, strategic and operational elements. Zonation distinguishing six different zones and corresponding management regimes continues to be a major instrument and an entire chapter is dedicated to the buffer zone in recognition of the crucial importance of the surroundings of the property. While caveats remain in terms of ensuring reliable funding and capacity for implementation and the limited mandate in terms of addressing threats stemming from outside the property, both the process and the product are good examples of moving beyond a purely expert-driven approach to management planning.

► Management effectiveness

Some Concern

While strong credit is due for the dedication of past and current staff for protecting the park from many threats under often adverse conditions and a wide range of political and economic settings over more than 40 years, it is no secret that law enforcement suffers from constraints in terms of resources and capacity. External projects understandably focus on buffer zone management, i.e. on areas which are not part of the property but are likely to influence or even shape its future. Thereby, core tasks in the property routinely face constraints.

► Implementation of Committee decisions and recommendations

Mostly Effective

The inscription decision suggested a "need for a rural development project in the buffer zone", to which the State Party has responded by way of several projects over the years, including an active project at the time of writing. The simultaneous biosphere reserve approach can likewise be interpreted as being compatible with the above need articulated by the Committee. Later on, the Committee requested the formalization of the enlargement of the national park at the national level by way of a minor boundary modification, which was successfully submitted by the State Party and adopted by the Committee. More recently, the Committee endorsed the recommendations offered by the 2010 reactive monitoring mission. The State Party has since been addressing some of these recommendations, leaving room for further consolidation of follow-up.

► Boundaries

Mostly Effective

The boundaries of the Park were set by Supreme Decree in 1973, and enlarged in 2002. The World Heritage property was enlarged in 2009 to coincide with the expanded boundaries of the national park. Today the property thus encompasses the entire Manu watershed, thereby coinciding with an ecological landscape unit. The 2010 IUCN/World Heritage Centre reactive monitoring mission recommended that the Park’s boundaries be expanded to include the adjacent Megantoni Nature Reserve. The World

Heritage Committee adopted this suggestion in its decision 35COM 7B.34.

► Sustainable finance

Some Concern

The property has multiple funding sources: a relatively reliable governmental budget, which has been stable to increasing over the last year, more volatile fees from a limited number of tourists and project funding. The latter includes the option to access PROFONANPE, the national protected areas fund, and in principle any other external funding source, i.e. foundations, NGOs, private sector, multilateral and bilateral cooperation etc. Given the scale of the park, funding remains modest (Manu SPreport, 2011). Given that the main challenges are not necessarily conventional protected areas issues but rather broader societal decision-making at the level of and beyond the Peruvian Amazon, funding is not necessarily the major bottleneck in the future of the property. At the same time, it is clear that adequate and reliable funding is indispensable and requires consolidation.

► Staff training and development

Some Concern

There is a national training strategy and plan for protected area staff training. This is being implemented, but long-term funding needs to be secured. The high staff turnover is a major problem as trained staff leave (IUCN Consultation, 2013).

► Sustainable use

Some Concern

Consumptive natural resource use inside the national park is very limited and localized. Studies on indigenous hunting claim no signs of prey depletion, i.e. ongoing sustainability (e.g. da Silva et al. 2005), which is probably attributable to the ban on firearms. The inhabitants of the park are dependent on wild biodiversity, i.e. use is a necessity, which management is aware and respectful of. The main question is whether population growth and changing lifestyles may change the current situation, which is not of major acute concern. If defined as a form of sustainable use, the intensity of tourism is likewise no reason for acute concern.

► Education and interpretation programs

Mostly Effective

An environmental education network for the Manu Biosphere Reserve is made up of NGOs, municipalities, regional governments, environmental; authorities, and education institutions. Working with the network, the Park developed an Environmental Education program which orients the work of the network members. The network works with schools in the region, and also does training for government officials and Park personnel. (Parkswatch Profile, 2009) However, funding remains a major issue (IUCN Consultation, 2013).

► Tourism and visitation management

Mostly Effective

Most interpretation for visitors is carried out by guides contracted by tour operators. Visitor information centers are located at Salvacion and El Limonal. The Salvacion centre is mainly used by local people for environmental education.
(Parkwatch Profile, 2009; IUCN Consultation, 2013).

► Monitoring

Some Concern

The current Master Plan contains a structured monitoring programme combining remote sensing, ground trouthing and counts of selected species. In addition, researchers and NGOs have been contributing to the monitoring of various parameters and species.

► Research

Mostly Effective

The renowned Coca Cashu Biological Station has had a presence in the national park for more than four decades and is widely respected as one of the key locations enabling the contemporary understanding of the ecology of tropical forests. The scientific productivity of the station is unmatched in the tropical forests in and possibly beyond South America.

Overall assessment of protection and management

Some Concern

Despite challenges in terms of human and financial resources, park management has been effective in maintaining a very good state of conservation throughout the vast majority of the property. While this is partially a function of the scale, remoteness and terrain of the property it is also a function of the strong dedication of leadership and staff under at times adverse conditions. Reliable long-term funding is needed to adequately address the threats within and around the property.

► Assessment of the effectiveness of protection and management in addressing threats outside the site

Serious Concern

Due to its mandate focusing on protected areas and limited human and financial resources, routine park management primarily addresses threats inside the property when most threats originate outside of it. Park management and SERNANP more broadly is perfectly aware of this fundamental dilemma. The simultaneous biosphere reserve approach, including the recent expansion of the Manu biosphere reserve are a management response to this very dilemma. While important efforts are made in the buffer zone, they continue to rely on external funding and support at the level of projects. Eventually, a major consolidation and institutionalization to coordinate and negotiate with relevant sectors, stakeholders and rights-holders beyond the level of individual projects. Despite the still very good state of conservation of the property itself preparedness and responses to the advancing development frontier remain inadequate. Therefore, the effectiveness of addressing external threat is ranked as a serious concern.

► Best practice examples

The history of Manu National Park is a remarkable success story starting in the late 1960s, at a time when tropical rainforest conservation was not on the international agenda, the term biodiversity did not even exist and the Amazonian forests seemed inexhaustible. A small number of Peruvian

conservationists had the vision, capacity and political clout to create the national park as the globally largest tropical rainforest protected area at the time. Despite ups and downs in management and funding and mounting concerns about ongoing and anticipated changes of the land and resource use dynamics in the surrounding landscape, Manu National Park continues to be in a good state of conservation more than four decades after its creation.

State and trend of values

Assessing the current state and trend of values

World Heritage values

► **Enormous altitudinal gradient and mosaic of highly diverse ecosystems and habitats**

Low Concern
Trend:Deteriorating

Given the extreme isolation of the site, and the small number of indigenous residents within it, direct human impacts are still very low. However, population is growing in and near the site and the overall pressure is also rising as significant changes in the broader landscape occur, including large-scale gas extraction, gold mining, logging and infrastructure projects. The eventual removal of cattle and corresponding use of fire in some of the highland grassland will allow for the recovery of the ecotone between the puna vegetation and montane forests (IUCN Consultation, 2013).

► **Exceptional biological diversity and rare, endemic and endangered species**

Low Concern
Trend:Stable

The expected future impacts of an increasingly close development frontier, in particular to the south of the property will eventually increase the pressure on many taxonomic groups, such as predators due to human-wildlife conflicts and poaching of birds, mammals and fish. At this stage, impacts are still very limited inside the property.

► **Exceptionally high degree of naturalness and integrity**

Good

Trend:Stable

To this day, most of the the property continues to be characterized by an exceptionally high degree of naturalness and integrity due to the configuration, scale, remoteness and effective conservation.

Summary of the Values

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

Low Concern

Trend: Deteriorating

While the current state of World Heritage Values is very good, future threats from major changes in the broader region, expected climate change and the increasing human footprint in and around the Property combine to give a high level of concern. The social, cultural and environmental consequences of ongoing development schemes, including oil and gas, road infrastructure and logging need to be better understood and considered in regional and sector planning. Connectivity with other protected areas in the region should be considered in such planning.

► **Assessment of the current state and trend of other important biodiversity values**

Data Deficient

Trend: Data Deficient

.

Additional information

Benefits

Understanding Benefits

► History and tradition, Sacred natural sites or landscapes, Sacred or symbolic plants or animals, Cultural identity and sense of belonging

While Manu National Park is not formally recognized under cultural World Heritage criteria, the long and ongoing history of indigenous occupation is noteworthy. Important Incan and Pre-Incan ruins and petroglyphs are distributed within and around what today constitutes the property. According to the local legend of Paititi, the "Lost City of the Incas" is located within the property. Various indigenous peoples are living in Manu National Park. Some of them are sedentary and in regular contact with the “modern world”, while others maintain a semi-nomadic lifestyle as hunter-gatherers in so-called "voluntary isolation" or “initial contact”, respectively (2010 IUCN-World Heritage Centre mission report, PRO-MANU, 2003).

► Importance for research

Cocha Cashu Biological Station located within the property has been one of the foremost references for scientific research in tropical ecology for decades. The scientific work conducted in the property has been significantly enhancing the understanding of (neo-)tropical forest ecosystems.

► Collection of medicinal resources for local use, Outdoor recreation and tourism

Wild biodiversity is the only or primary source of medicinal products for many indigenous peoples and local communities in the park and region. It is clear that both the genetic resources and the indigenous knowledge about medicinal properties of wild biodiversity are valuable and most sensitive resources.

Tourism is currently at a low level, but may have considerable growth potential. If realized tourism is likely to - and should - remain localized to minimize environmental, cultural and social impacts.

►

Legal subsistence hunting of wild game, Collection of wild plants and mushrooms, Fishing areas and conservation of fish stocks

The indigenous peoples living in or periodically / episodically using Manu National Park are accepted as legitimate and directly resource-dependent subsistence users despite a less than clear legal framework.

► **Livestock grazing areas**

Livestock grazing occurs near the Callanga community in the transition between the Andean puna grassland and montane forests.

► **Wilderness and iconic features**

Manu National Park, the largest tropical forest protected area in the world at the time of first designation is renowned as an inspiring and iconic place in the scientific, conservation and parts of the travel communities.

► **Carbon sequestration, Soil stabilisation, Flood prevention, Water provision (importance for water quantity and quality)**

The large and mostly forested property stores important amounts of carbon; the intact native vegetation prevents erosion in an area where high precipitation coincides with steep terrain. Furthermore, the property's natural forest cover contributes to the regulation of the entire Manu River watershed.

Summary of benefits

The conservation of what may be the most biodiverse terrestrial ecosystems on earth and distinct indigenous cultures under enormous pressure is a globally significant and irreplaceable benefit of the property. Due to the scale and intactness of the property further benefits include important ecosystem services. The conservation of Manu National Park while respecting the rights of its indigenous inhabitants is one of the last opportunities to try and provide indigenous peoples in voluntary isolation and initial contact with the option to continue their traditional lifestyles if they so wish.

Projects

Compilation of active conservation projects

№	Organization/ individuals	Project duration	Brief description of Active Projects
1	SERNANP, Regional Authorities		Vilcabamba-Amboro Conservation Corridor; Strengthening the Management of Protected Areas Influenced by the Southern Inter-Oceanic Highway; Endowment Fund for the Operation of the 5 involved protected areas.
2	San Diego Zoo		Enhanced management of the Cocha Cashu Biological Station
3	MINAM (Implemented by UNDP and financed by GEF)		Transforming Management of Protected Area/Landscape Complexes to Strengthen Ecosystem Resilience
4	DRIS, BMZ, EU, Welt Hunger Hilfe, GFA, Hivos, Cesvi		Programa Manu-Amarakaeri (2011-2015)
5	Frankfurt Zoological Society		Project: ProBosque Manu. 5 year project financed by BMUB working to reduce land-use change in and around Manu, focussed on improving practices with local communities in and around the park.

Compilation of potential site needs

№	Site need title	Brief description of potential site needs	Support needed for following years
1	Development of innovative and diversified financing mechanisms	The full range of revenue options from conservation funds, including the existing PROFONANPE, as well as from tourism revenues, extractive industries and PES-Schemes and REDD+ deserves to be explored.	

№	Site need title	Brief description of potential site needs	Support needed for following years
2	Cooperation with SERNANP and partners in planning, management and governance	There are opportunities to further consolidate strategic planning and management. More importantly, the evolving relationship with sectors, stakeholders and rights-holders within and adjacent to the property boil down to governance questions which would likewise benefit from a more coherent and strategic approach. Specifically, the role and rights of the sedentary indigenous residents in the national park require a more structured debate and negotiation of the interface between acknowledged rights to self-determination and legally established nature conservation requirements.	

REFERENCES

№	References
1	Catenazzi, A., Lehr, E., von May, R. 2013. The amphibians and reptiles of Manu National Park and its buffer zone, Amazon basin and eastern slopes of the Andes, Peru. Biota Neotropica 13(4): 269–283.
2	Dourojeanni, M., Barandiarán, A., Dourojeanni, D. 2009. Amazonia Peruana en 2021. Explotación de recursos naturales e infraestructuras: ¿Qué está pasando? ¿Qué es lo que significan para el futuro? ProNaturaleza - Fundación Peruana para la Conservación de la Naturaleza. Primera edición 2009. Lima, Peru.
3	Foster, R. 1985. Flora de las tierras bajas del Manu, 1983. In: Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina (UNA-La Molina). 1985. Reporte Manu. Centro de Datos para la Conservación. La Molina, Lima.
4	Gallice, G., Larrea-Gallegos, G., Vázquez-Rowe, I. 2017. The threat of road expansion in the Peruvian Amazon. Oryx, 1-9. doi:10.1017/S0030605317000412.
5	Huertas, B., Garcia, A. (eds.) 2003. Los pueblos indígenas de Madre de Dios: Historia, etnografía y coyuntura (IWGIA Documento No. 39). Puerto Maldonado, Perú: Federación Nativa del Río Madre de Dios and International Working Group on Indigenous Affairs.
6	IUCN. 1987. IUCN Evaluation of the World Heritage nomination of Manu National Park, Peru.
7	Ohl-Schacherer, J., Shepard, G.H., Kaplan, H., Peres, C.A., Levi, T., Yu, D.W. (2007). The Sustainability of Subsistence Hunting by Matsigenka Native Communities in Manu National Park, Peru. Conservation Biology Volume 21(5): 1174-1185.
8	PRO-MANU. 2003. Poblaciones indígenas de la Reserva de Biosfera del Manu. Cusco, Peru.
9	PRO-MANU/INRENA. 2003. El Manu a través de la historia. Cusco, Peru.
10	Patterson, B.D., Stotz, D.F., Solari, S. 2006. Mammals and birds of the Manu Biosphere Reserve, Peru. Fieldiana. Zoology, New Series 110. Field Museum of Natural History.
11	Republic of Peru. 1986. Manu National Park. World Heritage Nomination.
12	SERNANP. 2013a. Plan Maestro 2013 - 2018 Del Parque Nacional del Manu. . Accessed on 04 April 2017.

№	References
13	SERNANP. 2013b. Plan Maestro 2013 - 2018 Del Parque Nacional del Manu. Diagnóstico. . Accessed on 04 April 2017.
14	Shepard, G.H., Rummenhoeller, K., Ohl, J., Yu, D.W. 2010. Trouble in Paradise: Indigenous populations, anthropological policies, and biodiversity conservation in Manu National Park, Peru. Journal of Sustainable Forestry 29(2): 252-301.
15	Terborgh, J. 1999. Requiem for Nature. Shearwater Books / Island Press.
16	The Guardian. 2017. The top 10 threats to the most biodiverse place on planet Earth. . Accessed on 04 April 2017.
17	UNEP/OTCA. 2009. GEOAMAZONIA. Environment Outlook in Amazonia.
18	Vriesendorp, C., Rivera Chávez, L., Moskovits, D. Shopland, J. (eds). 2004. Rapid Biological Inventory of Megantoni, Peru. The Field Museum, Centro para el Desarrollo del Indígena Amazónico (CEDIA), Herbario Vargas, Universidad Nacional San Antonio Abad del Cusco, Museo de Historia Natural de la Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Centro de Conservación, Investigación y Manejo de Áreas Naturales (CIMA-Cordillera Azul). Rapid Biological Inventories Report 15.
19	Yu, D. W., Shepard, G. H., Ohl-Schacherer, J., Levi, T. 2013. Resolviendo el conflicto “parque-personas” en el Manu, con la estrategia ‘Ocupar la Amazonía’. Reporte Manu 2013: Pasión por la investigación en la Amazonía Peruana (eds. J. Groenendijk, A. Tovar & W. Wust), pp. 342–368. San Diego Zoo Global Peru y SERNANP, Lima, Peru.
20	da Silva, M. N. F. , Shepard Jr., G. H., Yu, D. W. 2005. Conservation Implications of Primate Hunting Practices Among the Matsigenka of Manu National Park. Neotropical Primates 13(2): 31-36.