IUCN Conservation Outlook Assessment 2014 **(archived)**
Finalised on 23 September 2014

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

Great Himalayan National Park Conservation Area

SITE INFORMATION

Country:
India
Inscribed in: 2014
Criteria:
(x)

Site description:

This National Park in the western part of the Himalayan Mountains in the northern Indian state of Himachal Pradesh is characterized by high alpine peaks, alpine meadows and riverine forests. The 90,540 ha property includes the upper mountain glacial and snow meltwater sources of several rivers, and the catchments of water supplies that are vital to millions of downstream users. The GHNPCA protects the monsoon-affected forests and alpine meadows of the Himalayan front ranges. It is part of the Himalaya biodiversity hotspot and includes twenty-five forest types along with a rich assemblage of fauna species, several of which are threatened. This gives the site outstanding significance for biodiversity conservation.
© UNESCO

SUMMARY

2014 Conservation Outlook

Good with some concerns

GHNPCA is of global significance for the conservation of Western Himalayan biodiversity. Its size, remote location, rugged topography and inaccessibility contribute to the effective conservation management of important habitats and endangered species present at the property. The property was inscribed in 2014 at the same time at this initial conservation outlook assessment. As such it is difficult to assess trends with respect to its values as a WH site, however it appears that these have been well protected and are stable, profiting from the protection of the GHNP and Wildlife Sanctuaries created in 1999 and 1994 respectively.
The property is legally well-protected and managed as a single unit under a single management plan spanning the period 2010-2020. There are currently no significant threats to the site however, careful monitoring and management is necessary to mitigate negative impacts from human occupation within the Sainj WLS and the adjoining Ecozone which acts as a buffer zone. Efforts to enable rights-based conservation approaches should continue including the phasing out of grazing within Tirthan WLS and strengthening where possible consistently high levels of legal protection across the property. The context of the site within a larger complex of protected lands bodes well for its conservation outlook and provides opportunities for progressive expansion of the property.

Current state and trend of VALUES

Low Concern
Trend: Data Deficient

GHNPCA is of global significance for the conservation of Western Himalayan biodiversity. Its significant size, remote location, rugged topography and inaccessibility contribute to the effective conservation management of important habitats and endangered species present at the property. The buffer zone known as an Ecozone coincides with the areas of greatest human pressure and is

managed in sympathy with the core values of the GHNPCA. Human settlement related threats pose the greatest concern and include agriculture, localised poaching, traditional grazing, human-wildlife conflicts and hydropower development. Tourism impact is minimal and trekking routes are closely regulated. (WHC 38COM Decision, 2014).
Whilst it appears that the property's values are stable it is difficult to accurately assess trends given the relative newness of this inscription.

Overall THREATS

Low Threat

The site is generally well buffered from threats because it is a high elevation remote system located in a larger complex of protected areas. The inclusion of the Tirthan and Sainj Wildlife Sanctuaries as part of the property ensures a more complete protection of the GHNPCA within a contiguous area with a more ecologically sound boundary. Whilst it opens up concerns regarding the impacts of grazing and human settlements, these shortcomings in protective status are outweighed by the greatly improved integrity of the property.

Overall PROTECTION and MANAGEMENT

Mostly Effective

There is an effective management regime in place including an overall management plan and adequate resourcing. The property is subject to sound legal protection however the two Wildlife Sanctuaries permit a degree of human use which requires careful monitoring and management. The property has a buffer zone along its south-western side (Ecozone). Continued attention is required to manage sensitive community development issues in this buffer zone. The extent and impacts of high pasture grazing in the Tirthan area of the property needs to be assessed and grazing phased out as soon as practicable. Impacts arising from small human settlement of the area are being addressed however more local community engagement in management decisions could be fostered in order to fully empower communities and continue to build a strong sense of support and stewardship for the GHNPCA. (IUCN Evaluation 2014)

FULL ASSESSMENT

Description of values

Values

World Heritage values

- **Important natural habitats and associated endemic and threatened species within the globally significant Western Himalayas**
  Criterion:(x)

  The Great Himalayan National Park (GHNPCA) is a contiguous protected area of 90,540 ha embedded within a larger mosaic of protected lands covering some 195,000ha. The property contains 25 forest types along with a rich assemblage of fauna species, several of which are threatened. (IUCN Evaluation, 2013), (WHC 38COM Decision, 2014). GHNPCA spans a wide elevational range of more than 4,000 metres and exhibits a significant number of transitional species between two of the world’s major biogeographic realms, the Palearctic and Indomalayan Realms. The property protects the monsoon-affected forests and alpine meadows of the Himalayan front ranges and is home to 805 vascular plant species, 192 species of lichen, 12 species of liverworts and 25 species of mosses. Some 58% of its angiosperms are endemic to the Western Himalayas. The Park also protects some 31 species of mammals, 209 birds, 9 amphibians, 12 reptiles and 125 insects. The nominated property provides habitat for 4 globally threatened mammals, 3 globally threatened birds and a large number of medicinal plants. (IUCN Evaluation, 2014)

Other important biodiversity values

► Significant biodiversity values

The property is part of the Himalaya biodiversity hotspot and is a WWF Global 200 Ecoregion. The property is also a Birdlife International Endemic Bird Area (IUCN Evaluation, 2014). GHNPCA supports many restricted-range bird species. There is a total of some 209 bird species dependent on the Park and its environs, including 50 species that are summer migrants.(IUCN Evaluation, 2012)

Assessment information

Threats

Current Threats

Low Threat

There are two threats of significance in the property. The Tirthan WLS is currently subject to traditional grazing and whilst this is being phased out, it requires continual monitoring and management to ensure that it is addressed in an appropriate timeframe. The Management of the Park has had an ongoing commitment to resolve rights -based issues with respect to local communities and indigenous peoples, particularly in the Sainj WLS where there are approximately 120 inhabitants, but also in the Ecozone. The continuing process to sensitively resolve access and use rights by these communities and the fostering of alternative livelihoods is essential for the ongoing protection and conservation of the area. Whilst local communities are engaged in management decisions more work is needed to ensure complete cooperation and engagement of the local communities in the decision making processes. (WHC 38 COM Decision,2014)

► Livestock Farming / Grazing

Low Threat

Inside site

Whilst there are no inhabitants in Tirthan WLS there continues to be impacts felt from grazing of sheep and other livestock. (IUCN Evaluation, 2014)

► Other Biological Resource Use

Very Low Threat
Inside site

At the time of the Evaluation Report in 2012 there was Illegal medicinal plant collection occurring within the Park. The employment of Forest Guards, regular patrols, education, the establishment of nurseries and the alternative cultivation of herbs for sale in the Ecozone have minimised this threat. (IUCN Evaluation Mission, 2012)

► Housing/ Urban Areas

Low Threat
Inside site

There are only 120 permanent inhabitants in GHNPCA and they are localized in Sainj WLS. Programmes are in place to provide alternative livelihoods for them. (IUCN Evaluation, 2014). There are approx. 160 villages/15,000 inhabitants in the Ecozone (buffer zone) who are dependent on natural resources. Extensive programs have been set in place to provide alternative livelihoods including participation in ecotourism. (SP Referral Document, 2013)

► Commercial hunting

Very Low Threat

Hunting was banned within GHNP in 1984. This ban has been effective; however there is still some threat from organised (non-local) poachers within Sainj WLS, despite effective anti-poaching actions being taken in 2012 by the Park. (IUCN Evaluation, 2012)

► Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge systems

Low Threat
Inside site

Threats exist related to the interaction of people with the property. An

ongoing issue relates to the resolution of rights, however, for the majority of the property community rights and compensation issues have been settled through the Forest Rights Act and Indian government policy. The State Party's decision not to proceed with the change of protection status of the two Wildlife Sanctuaries to National Park (WHC 38COM Decision 2014) means that people can continue to co-exist with conservation objectives within the property. Nevertheless continued monitoring and management will be needed to mitigate negative impacts from the 3 villages within Sainj WLS and seasonal grazing in Tirthan WLS. In addition the interface between the property and the settled Ecozone requires ongoing management. (IUCN Evaluation 2013).

Potential Threats

Low Threat

The impacts of grazing and human settlements in Tirthan WLS and Sainj WLS are ongoing and continued attention is required to manage sensitive community development issues in the two wildlife sanctuaries and the Ecozone. (WHC 38COM Decision, 2014)

▶ Crop production, Logging/ Wood Harvesting, Livestock Farming / Grazing, Commercial hunting

Low Threat
Inside site
Outside site

In general, the Western Himalayas are under significant pressure from human activities from traditional livelihoods such as grazing, hunting, and the collection of medicinal plants and impacts such as temperate cash crops, commercial forestry, tourism and hydro power development. (IUCN Evaluation, 2013). However, the enlarged property results in a 'more robust conservation unit thus making it more resilient to the impacts of these threats. The traditional grazing in Tirthan WLS and the small human settlements in Sainj WLS are at the present time being actively managed. (IUCN Evaluation, 2014)

▶ Dams/ Water Management or Use

Very Low Threat

Outside site

At the time of the 2012 evaluation mission major hydroelectric developments were being constructed downstream of the property within the Ecozone (buffer zone). (IUCN Evaluation, 2013). The fact that these developments are downstream and dependent on the water catchment quality of the property should positively reinforce the need for strict protection of natural values.

Protection and management

Assessing Protection and Management

► Relationships with local people

Some Concern

Prior to the establishment of a National Park in 1999, about 2,500 people collected herbs and mushrooms from the area and about 35,000 sheep and goats grazed the Park. The transition between use and conservation in the property has been a phased process carried out in a socially responsible way. It has included compensation for traditional rights and continuing investments in the Ecozone (IUCN Evaluation, 2012). However sections of the local community remain seriously concerned about the erosion of rights and the impacts on local livelihoods and access. (IUCN Stakeholder Consultation, 2014).

► Legal framework and enforcement

Mostly Effective

The GHNP is afforded strict conservation protection under the Indian Wildlife Protection Act 1972. Whilst Tirthan WLS and Sainj WLS do not enjoy the same levels of strict protection as GHNP they are ‘designated to protect, propagate, and develop wildlife or its environment in areas of ecological and zoological significance’ (SP Referral Document, 2013). However, there are plans to establish National Park status over the Sainj WLS over time.
The status of the surrounding lands as protected areas (Khirganga National Park, Pin Valley National Park and Rupi Bharbha Wildlife Sanctuary respectively) provides enhanced legal protection to the property. (IUCN

Evaluation, 2013)

► Integration into regional and national planning systems

Data Deficient

GHNP is legislated under The Wildlife Protection Act of 1972. The Act is supported by small area micro plans in the Ecozone. This is to facilitate the participation of the village councils (called Panchayats) in the Ecologically Sustained Programmes (known as Ecodevelopment). (SP Nomination, 2011). However data remains deficient on understanding how the GHNPCA Management Plan (see below) is harmonized with surrounding regional and national planning frameworks.

► Management system

Highly Effective

A comprehensive management plan for the GHNPCA has been prepared for the period 2010-2020. This plan encompasses the GHNP, the Ecozone, and both Tirthan WLS and Sainj WLS. (IUCN Evaluation, 2012)

► Management effectiveness

Mostly Effective

The property is managed under one management plan which includes appropriate conservation, protection and management effectiveness requirements for the Park. However, each unit of the GHNPCA has distinct management objectives. For example GHNP, focuses on protection of resources while managing ecologically sustainable tourism; Sainj WLS’s priority is management of three villages within its boundaries to minimize their impacts on biodiversity; Tirthan WLS regulates the non-resident shepherds to minimize impacts of grazing by sheep and other livestock. (SP Referral Document, 2013; IUCN Evaluation, 2012)

► Implementation of Committee decisions and recommendations

Highly Effective

The State Party has been very responsive to the Committee’s decisions to date. Specifically a response was submitted to Decision 37COM 8B.11 in September 2013 which addressed all of the recommendations made by the

Committee pertaining to the addition of the two Wildlife Sanctuaries, continued strengthening of local community engagement, additional comparative values analysis and a commitment to progressively expand the property over time. (SP Referral Document, 2013)

► Boundaries

Highly Effective

The boundaries of GHNPCA are clearly defined and offer both geographic and legal protection. (IUCN Evaluation, 2013).
The property has a buffer zone along its south-western side (the 26,560 ha Ecozone) reflecting the areas of greatest human population pressure. The property is also afforded good protection in the north, east and south due to the rugged and difficult to access high mountains. (IUCN Evaluation, 2014)

► Sustainable finance

Mostly Effective

Financial resources for the Park allow adequate staffing. In 2012 GHNP had an annual salary budget of 19 million Rupees ($US348,000). Annual operational funds in 2012 included 6.9 million Rupees ($US126,350) for flora and fauna conservation, with capital funds including 2.5 million Rupees ($US46,000) for a National Medicinal Pant Board Project; 948,000 Rupees ($US17,350) for a Botanical Garden Project and an allocation of 2,074,200 Rupees ($US38,000) from the Biodiversity Conservation Society. (IUCN Evaluation, 2012).
An ongoing fund raising programme for the management of the GHNPCA has been established through a Park entry fee and income from the facilities created for Community Based Ecotourism.
Rs. 1,000,000 per year has been raised since 2002 and these funds contribute to marinating community related assets (such as the Community Training and Tourist Center at Sai Ropa) and to running training programmes for the staff and villagers. (SP Nomination, 2011)

► Staff training and development

Mostly Effective

In 2012 there were 71 permanent staff members and a number of temporary staff. Staff include 40 personnel for patrolling and nursery duties (IUCN

Evaluation, 2012).

► Sustainable use

Some Concern

Human settlement related threats such as agriculture, localized poaching, traditional grazing, human-wildlife conflicts and hydropower development pose the greatest threats to the GHNPCA. (WHC 38COM Decision, 2014).
The State Party carries out a range of efficient and effective actions which address concerns related to the property's sustainability. Trekking routes are monitored and managed to ensure no negative impacts on key species (SP Nomination, 2011).
Seasonal grazing in Tirthan WLS has the potential for adverse impact and requires management and progressive phasing out (IUCN Evaluation, 2014).
Hunting has been banned, however localized poaching has been known to take place. Illegal medicinal plant collection also occurs. Management programmes are in place to address these issues. (IUCN Evaluation, 2013)

► Education and interpretation programs

Mostly Effective

There are a number of information centres with conference/training room facilities. At Sai Ropa there is an Ecozone Community Center just outside the Gushaini entrance to the Park. Here there is a 520 m long "Biodiversity Trail" that has trees and medicinal plant species transplanted from the Park and a demonstration site for vermicomposting; a butterfly enclosure, and a solar energy demonstration site. (SP Nomination, 2011)

► Tourism and interpretation

Highly Effective

The annual average visitor numbers to the Park are very low (700 to 1000 per annum) due to challenging access. Use of trekking routes within the Park is managed using a permit system and it is guided by wildlife population monitoring and research. Tourism is encouraged in the Ecozone forests. Education and interpretive materials are provided by various means including a village level Street Theatre group as a part of a local NGO, as well as signage, maps, educational displays, park brochures, posters, and photo exhibitions. The Larji Information Center located outside the Park and near

the confluence of Sainj and Tirthan rivers caters to tourists, school children and the village community with a training centre and projection facility. Sai Ropa is an Ecozone Community Center 5km from Banjar and 5 km before the Gushaini entrance to the Park, which caters to tourists with a Forest Rest House and a photo exhibition (SP Nomination, 2011).

As noted above management is directed toward reducing impacts on trekking routes. For example, trekking routes within the Tirthan Valley were closed in deference to declining Western Tragopan numbers; Trails commonly impacted by heavy rains and mudslides are closed or re-routed to ensure that essential maintenance can be carried out; monitoring programmes evaluate fluctuations in population numbers and the status of certain species and evaluate the regimes adopted for conserving biodiversity. (SP Nomination, 2011)

► Monitoring

Mostly Effective

The State Party states it recognizes the need for monitoring and considers it “as an essential component of any viable strategy to conserve biological diversity because it provides a basis to track the status of various components of biodiversity over time.” The main ways this has occurred at the property are
• Monitoring of large mammals
• Monitoring of visitors: including wildlife tourists, pilgrims, and researchers
• Socio-economic monitoring : gathering information on demography, resource dependency, etc. in villages which are in the vicinity of GHNPCA (SP Nomination, 2011)

► Research

Mostly Effective

A number of large scale research projects have been undertaken in the years from 2002 up until 2011 with the bulk of funding coming from The State Party. These include the following:
• “Conservation & Cultivation of Medicinal Herbs in Sainj and Tirthan Ranges of GHNP”;
• “Conservation of the Western Tragopan through wider support of the local

community and Community Based Organisations”
• National workshop on “Ecotourism in Himalayas: Prospects and Challenges” - Product development and Marketing for Ecotourism.
• Conservation and Cultivation of Medicinal Herbs in the Ecozone of GHNP 2007-2011
• Establishment of Botanical Garden at Sai Ropa 2008-2011. (SP Nomination, 2011)

Overall assessment of protection and management

Mostly Effective

There is an effective management regime in place including an overall management plan and adequate resourcing. The property is subject to sound legal protection however the two Wildlife Sanctuaries permit a degree of human use which requires careful monitoring and management. The property has a buffer zone along its south-western side (Ecozone). Continued attention is required to manage sensitive community development issues in this buffer zone. The extent and impacts of high pasture grazing in the Tirthan area of the property needs to be assessed and grazing phased out as soon as practicable. Impacts arising from small human settlement of the area are being addressed however more local community engagement in management decisions could be fostered in order to fully empower communities and continue to build a strong sense of support and stewardship for the GHNPCA. (IUCN Evaluation 2014)

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

Mostly Effective

In general GHNPCA is naturally buffered from external threats being a high elevation system in a very remote location. The property’s buffer zone along its south-western side which corresponds to the 26,560ha Ecozone is the area of greatest human population pressure and thus the source of impacts over many years. There is ongoing management of the resultant issues and management programmes to engage local communities in management decisions and to support more sustainable livelihoods. (IUCN Evaluation Mission, 2012). Ongoing and enhanced management efforts are desirable to deal with community empowerment, livelihood and rights concerns. (WHC 38

COM Decision, 2014)

State and trend of values

Assessing the current state and trend of values

World Heritage values

▶ **Important natural habitats and associated endemic and threatened species within the globally significant Western Himalayas**
Low Concern
Trend:Data Deficient

The site is significant for its conservation of Western Himalayan biodiversity. At the time of the evaluation mission in 2012 it was noted that the site was in an almost natural condition and this was due to the geographic location of the site at high altitude and hence its inaccessibility in conjunction with the abundance of individuals of many faunal species and it had no serious threats from introduced plant or animal species.
The addition of the Tirthan and Sainj Wildlife Sanctuaries to the WH site following the referral has strengthened the integrity and protection of the site by increasing it by 20% and creating a contiguous system of protected areas which is further buffered by nearly 200,000ha of other surrounding protected lands. Whilst the WLS are not designated as National Parks and do not enjoy the same levels of legislative protection, there is sufficient protection to ensure WH values are conserved. There is an ongoing need to monitor the impacts of the three small villages within Sainj WLS and on regulating shepherds to minimize the grazing impacts of sheep and other livestock within Tirthan WLS. (IUCN Evaluation Mission, 2012; IUCN Evaluation, 2014)
Whilst it appears that the property’s values are stable it is difficult to accurately assess trends given the relative newness of this inscription.

Other important biodiversity values

▶ **Significant biodiversity values**

The property is part of the Himalaya biodiversity hotspot and is a WWF

Global 200 Ecoregion. The property is also a Birdlife International Endemic Bird Area (IUCN Evaluation, 2014). GHNPCA supports many restricted-range bird species. There is a total of some 209 bird species dependent on the Park and its environs, including 50 species that are summer migrants.(IUCN Evaluation, 2012)

Summary of the Values

▶ **Assessment of the current state and trend of World Heritage values**
Low Concern
Trend: Data Deficient

GHNPCA is of global significance for the conservation of Western Himalayan biodiversity. Its significant size, remote location, rugged topography and inaccessibility contribute to the effective conservation management of important habitats and endangered species present at the property. The buffer zone known as an Ecozone coincides with the areas of greatest human pressure and is managed in sympathy with the core values of the GHNPCA. Human settlement related threats pose the greatest concern and include agriculture, localised poaching, traditional grazing, human-wildlife conflicts and hydropower development. Tourism impact is minimal and trekking routes are closely regulated. (WHC 38COM Decision, 2014).
Whilst it appears that the property’s values are stable it is difficult to accurately assess trends given the relative newness of this inscription.

Additional information

Key conservation issues

▶ **Continuation of traditional grazing in Tirthan Wildlife Sanctuary**
Local

The Tirthan Wildlife Sanctuary although uninhabited continues to be impacted by the grazing of sheep and other livestock. Whilst this is being managed there is a need for a process to understand the impacts and consider phasing out

grazing.

▶ **Community based issues particularly in Sainj WLS and the Ecozone**
National

There are no human settlements in GHNP or Tirthan WLS however there are approx. 120 people living in Sainj WLS and approx. 15,000 in the Ecozone. There is a continuing need to expedite, in accordance with legislated processes, the resolution of community rights based issues and to ensure that the interface between human development and the site is effectively managed to deliver balanced outcomes for people and nature.

Benefits

Understanding Benefits

▶ **Does management of the site provide jobs (e.g. for managers or rangers)?**

The management is engaging in fostering alternative livelihoods which are sympathetic to the conservation of the area. This includes local communities becoming engaged in management decisions as well as gaining jobs such as park rangers.
Women’s groups in particular are engaged in schemes to develop a framework for managing ecotourism within the Ecozone and GHNPCA. The purpose of this is to guarantee economic benefits were returned (and equitably distributed) to the community. (IUCN Evaluation, 2012)

▶ **Traditional agriculture**

The two Wildlife Sanctuaries are clearly important to the livelihoods of a small number of people who either reside within Sainj WLS or graze livestock within Tirthan WLS. The resolution of rights to ensure adequate protection of the site’s values will likely require careful consideration of alternative livelihoods.

▶ **Water provision (importance for water quantity and quality)**

GHNP CA includes the upper (5000-6000 metre high) mountain glacial and

snow melt water source origins of the westerly flowing Jiwa Nal, Sainj and Tirthan Rivers and the north-westerly flowing Parvati River which are all headwater tributaries to the River Beas and subsequently, the Indus River. The property includes an elevational range from high alpine peaks of over 6,000m a.s.l to riverine forest at altitudes below 2,000m a.s.l. forming a critical catchment area vital to millions of downstream users. (WHC 38 COM Decision,2014)

Summary of benefits

The management of the park has taken notable steps to work with the community over many years reinforcing the links between investment in local livelihoods and successful conservation of biodiversity in the Park. Prior to park establishment, about 2,500 people collected herbs and mushrooms from the Park and about 35,000 sheep and goats grazed the Park. The transition between use and conservation in GHNP has aspired to be a socially responsible and phased process that has included compensation for traditional rights and continuing investments in the Ecozone designed to support people. Successful response strategies have included the empowerment of the poor, given that rural poor are the most dependent on forest resources for livelihood needs, with women being the poorest. (IUCN Evaluation, 2013)

Projects

Compilation of active conservation projects

№	Organization/individuals	Project duration	Brief description of Active Projects

1	State Party of India	A number of large scale research projects have been undertaken in the years from 2002 up until 2011 with the bulk of funding coming from The State Party. These include the following: • “Conservation & Cultivation of Medicinal Herbs in Sainj and Tirthan Ranges of GHNP”; • “Conservation of the Western Tragopan through wider support of the local community and Community Based Organizations” • National workshop on “Ecotourism in Himalayas: Prospects and Challenges” - Product development and Marketing for Ecotourism. • Conservation and Cultivation of Medicinal Herbs in the Ecozone of GHNP 2007-2011 • Establishment of Botanical Garden at Sai Ropa 2008-2011

Compilation of potential site needs

№	Site need title	Brief description of potential site needs	Support needed for following years
1	Regional assessment of further candidate areas with World Heritage potential	The WHC recommended that an assessment of the scope of ecosystems within the Himalayas and adjacent mountain systems be undertaken. It suggested that this could be done with the possible co-operation of IUCN, other partners such as the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) and the newly established UNESCO Category 2 Centre on World Natural Heritage Management and Training for Asia-Pacific Region in India. The reason for this project would be to identify potential World Heritage candidate areas and boundary configurations in this region, with a view to potential serial nominations and extensions of the current property. (WHC 38COM Decision, 2014)	

REFERENCES

№	References
1	IUCN (2012) Evaluation Mission Report. Great Himalayan National Park IUCN. Gland Switzerland
2	IUCN (2013) Evaluation Report. Great Himalayan National Park Conservation Area. IUCN Gland, Switzerland
3	IUCN (2014) Evaluation Report. Great Himalayan National Park Conservation Area. IUCN Gland, Switzerland
4	IUCN (2014). IUCN Stakeholder Consultation. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland
5	State Party of India (2011). Great Himalayan National Park Nomination. Submitted to 37 COM
6	State Party of India (2013). Great Himalayan National Park Referral Document. Submitted to 38 COM
7	UNESCO (2014) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value Great Himalayan National Park Conservation Area http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1406. Accessed July 2014
8	World Heritage Committee (2013) Decision 37 COM 8B.11. Phnom Penh, Cambodia
9	World Heritage Committee (2014). Decision 38 COM 8B.7. Doha, Qatar