

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Prehistoric Rock Art Sites in the Côa Valley and Siega Verde

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Portugal
- Spain

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

866bis

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1998, 2010





1.3 - Geographic Information Table















Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Broeira	41.053 / -7.101	4.57	?	4.57	1998
Canada do Inferno / Rego da vide	41.05 / -7.102	10.09	?	10.09	1998
Faia	40.934 / -7.085	5.94	?	5.94	1998
Faia - Vale Afonsinho	0 / 0	3.03	?	3.03	1998
Fonte Frieira	41.068 / -7.101	1.57	?	1.57	1998
Meijapão	41.051 / -7.1	2.07	?	2.07	1998
Penascosa	40.986 / -7.1	22.32	?	22.32	1998
Quinta da Barca	40.986 / -7.101	20.48	?	20.48	1998
Quinta da Ervamoira	41.02 / -7.105	9.53	?	9.53	1998
Quinta do Fariseu	0 / 0	10.09	?	10.09	1998
Ribeira de Piscos / Quinta dos Poios	41.018 / -7.117	12.4	?	12.4	1998
Ribeirinha	40.984 / -7.068	6.11	?	6.11	1998
Salto do Boi	40.98 / -7.1	5.16	?	5.16	1998
Vale de Figueira / Teixugo	41.034 / -7.117	8.73	?	8.73	1998
Vale de Moinhos	41.052 / -7.102	4.57	?	4.57	1998
Vale de Namoradas	41.035 / -7.085	3.7	?	3.7	1998
Zone archéologique d'art rupestre de Siega Verde	40.698 / -6.661	44.5	?	44.5	
Total (ha)		174.86	0	174.86	

Comment

Buffer zone of Prehistoric Rock Art Sites in the Côa Valley 20543.48ha.

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Parque Arqueológico Do Vale Coa, 1:100000	21/12/2007	
Broeira	25/06/1997	
Canada do Inferno / Rego da vide	25/06/1997	
Faia	25/06/1997	

Faia - Vale Afonsinho	25/06/1997	
Fonte Frieira	25/06/1997	
Meijapão	25/06/1997	
Penascosa	25/06/1997	
Quinta da Barca	25/06/1997	
Quinta da Ervamoira	25/06/1997	
Quinta do Fariseu	25/06/1997	
Ribeira de Piscos / Quinta dos Poios	25/06/1997	
Ribeirinha	25/06/1997	
Salto do Boi	25/06/1997	
Vale de Figueira / Teixugo	25/06/1997	
Vale de Moinhos	25/06/1997	
Vale de Namoradas	25/06/1997	
Map of Inscribed Property - Siega Verde 2010	28/01/2009	

Comment

Updated maps not altering the boundaries of the property are being submitted to substitute those featured above (except Map of Inscribed Property - Siega Verde 2010).

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Luís Pinho Lopes
Direção-Geral do Património Cultural
Arquitete
- Elisa de Cabo de la Vega
Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte
Subdirectora de Protección de Patrimonio Histórico
- Laura de Miguel Riera
Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte

Subdirección General de Protección de Patrimonio Histórico

- Esther Rodríguez
Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte
Subdirectora General Adjunta de Protección del Patrimonio Histórico

Comment

Add: Directorate General for Cultural Heritage Nuno Vassallo e Silva, PhD Director General Direção-Geral do Património Cultural Palácio Nacional da Ajuda 1349-021 Lisboa Portugal Telephone: +351213614221 Fax: +351213637047 Email: nvsilva@dgpc.pt rectify: Directorate General for Cultural Heritage Luiz de Pinho Lopes Architect Direção-Geral do Património Cultural Palácio Nacional da Ajuda (...)

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Fernando Real
Coa Parque Foundation
President

Comment

Add: Junta de Castilla y León D. Enrique Saiz Martín Dirección General de Patrimonio Cultural Consejería de Cultura y Turismo Monasterio de Nuestra Señora de Prado, s/n 47071 Valladolid (Spain) Telephone: +34 983.41.15.06 Fax: +34 983.41.15.68 E-mail: sebmarmar@jcy.es

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
2. [Complexo de arte rupestre paleolítica do vale do Côa \(portuguese only\)](#)
3. [Coa Valley \(Direcção Geral dos Edifícios e Monumentos Nacionais\)\(portuguese only\)](#)
4. [Instituto Portugues de Arqueologia \(portuguese only\)](#)
5. [Coa Valley Archaeological Park on the Internet \(Instituto Portugues de Arqueologia\)](#)

Comment

Add: a) www.patrimoniocultural.pt b) www.unescoportugal.mne.pt c) www.arte-coa.pt d) www.jcyl.es e) www.patrimoniocultural.jcyl.es f) www.monumentos.pt (Portuguese only) Please remove 3, 4 and 5 as they no longer exist.

1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)

Comment

European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Revised); Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (2009).

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief synthesis

The property includes the two Prehistoric Rock Art Sites in the Côa Valley (Portugal) and Siega Verde (Spain), consisting of rocky cliffs carved by fluvial erosion and embedded in an isolated rural landscape in which hundreds of panels with thousands of animal figures (5,000 in Foz Côa, around 440 in Siega Verde) have been engraved over several millennia. The rock-art sites of Foz Côa and Siega Verde represent the most remarkable open-air ensemble of Palaeolithic art on the Iberian Peninsula within the same geographical region. Foz Côa and Siega Verde provide the best illustration of the iconographic themes and organization of Palaeolithic rock art, which adopted the same modes in caves and in the open air, thus contributing to a greater understanding of this artistic phenomenon. Together they form a unique place of the prehistoric era, rich in material evidence of Upper Palaeolithic occupation.

Criterion (i): The rock engravings in Foz Côa and Siega Verde, dating from the Upper Palaeolithic to the final Magdalenian/ Epipalaeolithic (22.000 – 8.000 BCE), represent a unique example of the first manifestations of human symbolic creation and of the beginnings of cultural development which reciprocally shed light upon one another and constitute an unrivalled source for understanding Palaeolithic art.

Criterion (iii): The rock art of Foz Côa and Siega Verde, when considered together, throws an exceptionally illuminating light on the social, economic, and spiritual life of our early ancestors.

Integrity and authenticity

The integrity of the property is expressed primarily by the homogeneity and continuity in development within the spatial limits of the engraved rock surfaces as well as by the adoption

of the typical patterns of prehistoric paintings inside caves, thus confirming the argument for the integrity of this outdoor ensemble.

The authenticity of the property is demonstrated by stylistic and comparative considerations, which also include the examination of artistic themes and organization of rock engravings in caves. The only doubts relate to the interpretation of certain animal figures (e.g. woolly rhinoceros, bison, megaceros deer, reindeer, and felines).

Protection and management requirements

Siega Verde is protected under various national laws for heritage protection and planning and has been declared a BIC (Bien de interés cultural – property of cultural interest). Protection has been implemented since the BIC designation. Management is delegated to the local action group ADECOCIR (Association for the Development of the Region in Ciudad Rodrigo). The ADECOCIR manager is responsible for the overall management and maintenance of Siega Verde, while security is provided by the Junta de Castilla y León, which is also responsible for the maintenance of equipment. The Junta de Castilla y León has developed joint programmes with the Portuguese institution of IGESPAR (Instituto de Gestão do Património Arquitectónico e Arqueológico – Institute for the Management of the Architectural and Archaeological Heritage), which is responsible for the Côa Valley site, with the object of studying and presenting Siega Verde and Côa Valley together.

2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed

(i)(iii)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

(i) Represents a unique example of the first manifestations of human symbolic creation; (iii) This Site threw light on the social, economic, and spiritual life of our early ancestors.

2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised

2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

3. Factors Affecting the Property

3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact						Origin	
3.1	Buildings and Development								
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities								
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure								
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure								
3.2.3	Marine transport infrastructure								
3.3	Services Infrastructures								
3.3.5	Major linear utilities								
3.5	Biological resource use/modification								
3.5.1	Fishing/collecting aquatic resources								
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals								
3.5.5	Crop production								
3.5.7	Subsistence wild plant collection								
3.5.8	Commercial hunting								
3.6	Physical resource extraction								
3.6.2	Quarrying								
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric								
3.7.1	Wind								
3.7.2	Relative humidity								
3.7.3	Temperature								
3.7.4	Radiation/light								
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage								
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage								
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community								
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation								
3.9	Other human activities								
3.9.1	Illegal activities								
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage								
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events								
3.10.1	Storms								
3.10.2	Flooding								
3.10.3	Drought								
3.10.4	Desertification								
3.10.6	Temperature change								
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events								
3.11.2	Earthquake								
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition								
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)								
3.13	Management and institutional factors								
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities								
3.13.3	Management activities								
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside			

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.2 Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.1 Ground transport infrastructure	localised	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
3.3 Services Infrastructures					
3.3.5 Major linear utilities	localised	on-going	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.5 Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.1 Fishing/collecting aquatic resources	restricted	on-going	insignificant	high capacity	static
3.5.8 Commercial hunting	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.6 Physical resource extraction					
3.6.2 Quarrying	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.1 Wind	extensive	frequent	minor	low capacity	static
3.7.2 Relative humidity	extensive	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
3.7.3 Temperature	widespread	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
3.7.4 Radiation/light	widespread	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
3.8 Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.2 Society's valuing of heritage	widespread	on-going	significant	high capacity	increasing
3.10 Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.2 Flooding	localised	frequent	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.10.6 Temperature change	widespread	on-going	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.11 Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.5 Erosion and siltation/ deposition	localised	frequent	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.11.6 Fire (wildfires)	extensive	frequent	significant	medium capacity	increasing

3.17. Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to factors affecting the property

3.17.1 - Comments

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property **are adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property **are known** by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

Buffer zone of Prehistoric Rock Art Sites in the Côa Valley 20543,48ha.

4.2. Protective Measures

4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional) SPAIN

Siega Verde is protected under various national laws for heritage protection and planning and has been declared a BIC (Bien de interés cultural - property of cultural interest). Protection has been implemented since the BIC designation. The territorial area affected by the BIC is subject to various normative:

- The specific sectorial legislation, State law 16/1985 of the Spanish historical heritage, which establishes protective measures for all the caves with rock art. Specifically, as a property of cultural interest in the category of Declared Archaeological Zone, collected in the 12/2002 Act of 11 July of

the Cultural Heritage of Castilla y León; and the Decree 37/2007 of 19 April, that endorses the regulation for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Castilla y León.

- The sectorial legislation on land-use planning of the community of Castilla y León, collected in the 10/1998 law of 5 December, as amended by Act 12/2003 by December 23.

- The sectorial legislation on town planning by its condition of Rustic Land with Cultural Protection, collected in the Law 5/1999 of April 8 of Town Planning of Castilla y León and in Decree 22/2004 of 29 January, by which the regulations of Town Planning of Castilla y León is endorsed.

- Legislation on the competences of the municipalities in the area of Historic heritage, collected in the 1/1998 Act of 4 June of the Local system of Castilla y León.

- The environmental legislation on the protection of the public domain, collected in the 29/1985 law of 2 August of Waters and the Royal Legislative Decree 1/2001 of 20 July by which is endorsed the text consolidated the Water Act.

- The environmental legislation for the protection of the environment (Sites of Community Importance, future Conservation Special area, ZEC) of the province of Salamanca, collected in the 1997/1995 Royal Decree of 7 December by which measures are established to help guarantee biodiversity through the conservation of natural habitats and of wildlife and fauna (Transposition of the 92/43/CEE directive).

- The environmental legislation for the protection of the environment (Area of Special Protection for Birds) of the province of Salamanca, collected in the Directive Protection and management of the property 142/79/409/CEE of the Council of 2 April 1979 concerning the conservation of Woodland birds.

- The environmental legislation for the protection of livestock paths, collected in the 31/1995 law of 23 March on the conservation and protection of livestock paths

- The legislation for Roads development, collected in the Roads Act and under the supervision of the provincial government of Salamanca, responsible for the road network that crosses the Archaeological Zone.

- The legislation in agriculture and livestock, collected in the 14/1990 Act of 28 November of Concentracion Parcelaria de Castilla y León.

- Legislation in accessibility and removal of barriers, collected in the 3/1998 Act of 24 June for the development of correct spaces and public services.

PORTUGAL

Most land in the Coa Valley Archaeological Sites National Monument and inside its planned ZEP is privately owned. Public acquisition of the classified areas is in process. It is not government policy to acquire properties located inside the planned ZEP. Instead, private owners of this primarily rural area will be encouraged to maintain the traditional agriculture activities that shaped the present setting of the archaeological sites. To manage the Coa River Valley Archaeological Sites National Monument the Portuguese government created the PAVC (Parque Arqueológico do Vale do Coa- Coa Valley Archaeological Park). References to the creation of the Park are contained in Government Resolutions 4/96 and 42/96, published in the Diário da República (Official Journal of the Portuguese Republic) issues of January 17, 1996 and April 16, 1996, respectively. Through these resolutions, the Portuguese government halted the construction of a dam that threatened to submerge the archaeological sites and provided a fund (named PROCOA) of 25 billion PTE (some 150 million USD) to support the economic development of the region and the installation of the Archaeological Park. The latter was formally institutionalised as a department of the new IP A

(Instituto Portugues de Arqueologia- Portuguese Institute of Archaeology), an agency of the Ministry of Culture created through a government bill (Decreto-Lei 117/97) published in the Diario da Republica of May 14, 1997. Article 9, paragraph 1, item d) of this bill creates the Park. Article 13 defines its attributions as those of "manage, protect and organize for public visits, including the setting up of Museum facilities, the monuments included in the special protection zone of the Coa Valley. The classification of the Coa Valley Archaeological Sites as a National Monument was decided by the Portuguese Government on May 28, 1997 and is to be published soon as a government bill in the Diario da Republica (with number 193/97). Under Portuguese law (Lei de Bases do Património, number 13/85, published in the Diario da Republica of July 6, 1985), National Monuments must be preserved in their present condition. Any modification of that condition (including restoration) requires the previous agreement of the Ministry of Culture. Modification of the landscape and of land use patterns, as well as construction or demolition of works of man inside the boundaries of the ZEPs (Special Protection Zones), are subject to similar restrictions. Management of National Monuments and their ZEPs must be made through Planos de Salvaguarda (Preservation Plans) elaborated by the Ministry of Culture.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Monday, October 31, 2005

• Question 6.02

The ongoing process of creation of the PAVC allows for the establishment of specific spatial planning and zoning requirements. In the meanwhile the PAVC has had a leading role in land management activities in the area and also in the management of visits to the rock art sites through the creation of a restrictive visitation system coordinated by the PAVC.

Comment

SPAIN (Add by:) Legal protection: Law 12/2002, of 11 July, of Cultural Heritage of Castilla y León Decree 37/2007, of 19 April, approving the Regulation for the protection of Cultural Heritage of Castilla y León Decree 205/1998 declaring as Property of Cultural Interest, in the category of Archaeological Zone, the site of Siega Verde. PORTUGAL (Add:) Legal protection: Law no. 107/2001; Decree-Law no 309/2009; Decree-Law 35/2011. (The Law can be provided in English)

4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

An adequate legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are **some deficiencies in implementation**

4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

An adequate legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are **some deficiencies in implementation**

4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

An **adequate** legal framework exists for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone, but **there are some deficiencies in its implementation** which undermine the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the property

4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?

There is **acceptable** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies remain

4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures

Regarding the Spanish side of the property, a new agreement between the Regional Government of Castilla y León and the three municipalities included inside the property boundaries is about to be approved. Regarding the Portuguese side of the property, the regional municipal association (comprising 9 municipalities in the area) is a founding member of the Fundação Côa Parque.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

SPAIN

Management is delegated to the local action group ADECOCIR (Association for the Development of the Region in Ciudad Rodrigo). The ADECOCIR manager is responsible for the overall management and maintenance of Siega Verde, while security is provided by the Junta de Castilla y León, which is also responsible for the maintenance of equipment. The Junta de Castilla y León has developed joint programmes with the Portuguese institution of IGESPAR (Instituto de Gestão do Património Arquitectónico e Arqueológico - Institute for the Management of the Architectural and Archaeological Heritage), which is responsible for the Côa Valley site, with the object of studying and presenting Siega Verde and Côa Valley together.

PORTUGAL

The PAVC (Parque Arqueológico do Vale do Coa/ Coa Valley Archaeological Park) is in charge of management as well as of preservation and conservation. A research centre dedicated to the scientific study of all rock art in Portugal was created alongside the PAVC in the framework of the new IP A (Instituto Portugues de Arqueologia - Portuguese Institute of Archaeology). This agency will also be responsible for the scientific aspects of the conservation of Coa valley rock art. The NATURA 2000 network and the Natural Park of the International Douro River are managed by an agency of the Ministry of the Environment.

The boundaries of the ZEP (Zona Especial de Protecção - Special Protection Zone) for the National Monument of the Coa River Valley Archaeological Sites have already been studied and a solution has already been agreed upon by local authorities. Studies for the ZEP's Plano de Salvaguarda (Preservation Plan) was initiated in 1998.

The Coa Valley Archaeological Park has a permanent staff which includes five archaeologists in charge of research and management of public access and 12 trained guides to

accompany the visitor groups to the sites open to the public. The latter sites are also under permanent in situ surveillance, 24 hours a day; this task was contracted by the Park with a specialised security company which employs 16 guards to do the job. Eight four wheel drive vehicles with a capacity of eight people each (plus the driver/guide) are available to transport visitor groups to those sites. Departure is effected from two visitor centres established at the towns of Castelo Melhor and Muxagata and from the head office of the Park at Vila Nova de Foz Coa.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Monday, October 31, 2005

• Question 5.02

Stering group or similar management committee has been set up to guide the management of the site

• Question 5.03

Set up date: 1996

Function: To protect, preserve and divulge the archaeological heritage, developing tending shares to safeguard of existing the cultural and natural values in the area of the archaeological park, promoting the economic development and the quality of life of the populations and the enclosed communities.

Constituted: legal

• Question 5.05



Overall management system of the site

- Management by the State Party

Comment

There is a conservation and maintenance program as a result of the diagnosis of the state of conservation of the site, made and monitored by the Center for Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Properties, a public research center of the Regional Government. In addition to that, any intervention undertaken inside the property boundaries must be authorized by the Regional Government. Regarding cultural promotion, visits to the site are managed by the Local Action group ADECOCIR.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Extraits du dossier de nomination: Protection, gestion, suivi	N/A	Available	30/01/2009	
Extraits du dossier de nomination: Protection, gestion, suivi	N/A	Available	30/01/2009	

4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?

There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies / levels involved in the management of the property but it could be improved

4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?

The management system / plan is **fully adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

The management system is **only partially** being implemented

4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?

An annual work / action plan exists and **most or all activities** are being implemented and monitored

4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following

Local communities / residents	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Poor

4.3.8 - If present, do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Local communities **directly contribute** to some decisions relating to management

4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

No indigenous peoples are resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone

4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?

There is contact but only **some cooperation** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

4.3.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

Coordination between the Portuguese and Spanish sides of the property has been reinforced by a unique entry ticket for both parts of the World Heritage Property.

4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report

The Côa Valley Archaeological Park is now managed by the Côa Parque Foundation created by DL 35/2011, 8 March. This is a public foundation. The Natura 2000 network and the Douro International Natural Park are managed by the Institute for Nature Conservation and Forests. It is up to the Directorate-General for Cultural Heritage to enforce the obligations of the State in the fields of conservation, restoration, protection and enhancement of cultural heritage (DL 115/2011, 25 May).

4.4. Financial and Human Resources

4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	83%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	1%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	4%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	10%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	2%
Other grants	0%

4.4.2 - International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)

Title	Year	Amount	Link to source
International Symposium on the Conservation and Management of Prehistoric Rock Art Sites on the World Heritage List (Côa Valley, Portugal, 02-08 May 1999)	1999	20000.00	
Total		20000	

4.4.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?

The available budget is **inadequate** for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage

4.4.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?

Existing sources of funding are **not secure**

4.4.5 - Does the World Heritage property provide economic benefits to local communities (e.g. income, employment)?

There is **some flow** of economic benefits to local communities

4.4.6 - Are available resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

4.4.7 - Are resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure adequately maintained?

There is **basic** maintenance of equipment and facilities

4.4.8 - Comments, conclusion, and / or recommendations related to finance and infrastructure

4.4.9 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Full-time	75%
Part-time	25%

4.4.10 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Permanent	85%
-----------	-----

Seasonal	15%
----------	-----

4.4.11 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

4.4.12 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?

Human resources are **adequate** for management needs

4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Fair
Promotion	Poor
Community outreach	Poor
Interpretation	Good
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Fair
Conservation	Fair
Administration	Poor
Risk preparedness	Fair
Tourism	Fair
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Poor

4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Medium
Promotion	Medium
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	Medium
Education	Medium
Visitor management	Medium
Conservation	Medium
Administration	Medium
Risk preparedness	Medium
Tourism	Medium
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Medium

4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?

A capacity development plan or programme is in place and **partially implemented**; some technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally **but most of the technical work is carried out by external staff**

4.4.16 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

Regarding the Spanish side of the property, to the people who directly work on the property, we must add the staff of the Cultural Heritage General Directorate of the Regional Government, who ensures the protection of all the cultural properties of Castile and Leon.

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient**

4.5.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme of research**, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared widely** with the local, national and international audiences

4.5.4 - Please provide details (i.e. authors, title, and web link) of papers published about the World Heritage property since the last Periodic Report

Batista, A. M.; Balbín, R.; Fernández J. J et alii (2010). "Documenting open-air paleolithic engravings as a support of a complex management: a proposal of Côa (Portugal) and Siega Verde (Salamanca, Spain)". Seminar on Rock Art Graphic Documentation. Murcia, 2010. For more papers see <http://www.arte-coa.pt/index.php?Language=en&Page=Parque&SubPage=Bibliografia&Menu2=A>

4.5.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to scientific studies and research projects

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?

In **many locations and easily visible** to visitors

4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities / residents	Poor
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Poor
Visitors	Excellent
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Poor

4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?

There is a **limited and ad hoc** education and awareness programme

4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?

World Heritage status has influenced education, information and awareness building activities, **but it could be improved**

4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?

There is **excellent presentation and interpretation** of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property

4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

Visitor centre	Excellent
Site museum	Excellent
Information booths	Excellent
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Excellent
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Not needed

4.6.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to education, information and awareness building

4.7. Visitor Management

4.7.1 - Please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years

Last year	Minor Increase
Two years ago	Decreasing
Three years ago	Major Increase (100%+)
Four years ago	Static
Five years ago	Static

4.7.2 - What information sources are used to collect trend data on visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is managed **but improvements could be made**

4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?

There is **limited co-operation** between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation

4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

The fee is collected, and makes **some contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property

4.8. Monitoring

4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme** of monitoring, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Average
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Average
Industry	Poor
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

4.8.4 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?

Implementation is **underway**

4.8.5 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee

Promotion of activities for both properties has been initiated (i.e., joint exhibitions, unique ticket entry). On the other hand, in Spain, the Regional Government is preparing a new agreement with the three municipalities represented inside the world heritage site to reinforce the protection of the area and the conservation of its value.

4.8.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to monitoring

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

	World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.6	Physical resource extraction					
3.6.2	Quarrying (i)(iii)	No actions are planned.	The impact of quarrying is regularly monitored in the minute area affected at the Portuguese side of the property.	Ongoing.	Côa Parque Foundation.	There is an active quarry nearby one of the rock art sites in Canada do Inferno (Côa Valley, Portuguese side of the property).
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.3	Temperature (i)(iii)	Conservation Programs were established to monitor the impact of temperature on the fabric of the property.	Conservation Programs regularly monitor the impact of temperature on the fabric of the property by means of installed weather stations.	Ongoing.	The Côa Parque Foundation on the Portuguese side and Junta de Castilla y León and ADECOCIR on the Spanish side of the property.	See: FERNANDES, A. P. B., 2014. Natural Processes in the Degradation of Open-Air Rock-Art Sites. An urgency intervention scale to inform conservation. The case of the Côa Valley world heritage site, Portugal. Oxford: Archaeopress.
3.7.4	Radiation/light (i)(iii)	Conservation Programs were established to monitor the impact of radiation on the fabric of the property.	Conservation Programs regularly monitor impact of radiation on the fabric of the property by means of installed weather stations.	Ongoing.	The Côa Parque Foundation on the Portuguese side and Junta de Castilla y León and ADECOCIR on the Spanish side of the property.	See: FERNANDES, A. P. B., 2014. Natural Processes in the Degradation of Open-Air Rock-Art Sites. An urgency intervention scale to inform conservation. The case of the Côa Valley world heritage site, Portugal. Oxford: Archaeopress.
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage (i)(iii)	Programs to reach the local community and schools were created.	The impact of the said Programs is regularly monitored in meetings with local stakeholders on both sides of the property.	Ongoing.	The Côa Parque Foundation on the Portuguese side and Junta de Castilla y León and ADECOCIR on the Spanish side of the property.	Since World Heritage inscription there has been a continued and active effort to reach local communities and influential stakeholders.
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.6	Temperature change (i)(iii)	Conservation Programs were established to monitor the impact of temperature change on the fabric of the property.	Conservation Programs regularly monitor the impact of temperature change on the fabric of the property by means of installed weather stations.	Ongoing.	The Côa Parque Foundation on the Portuguese side and Junta de Castilla y León and ADECOCIR on the Spanish side of the property.	See: FERNANDES, A. P. B., 2014. Natural Processes in the Degradation of Open-Air Rock-Art Sites. An urgency intervention scale to inform conservation. The case of the Côa Valley world heritage site, Portugal. Oxford: Archaeopress.
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires) (i) (III)	Cleaning up and surveillance of the park's archaeological area	Regular monitoring of the condition of the property	Ongoing	The Côa Parque Foundation on the Portuguese side and Junta de Castilla y León and ADECOCIR on the Spanish side of the property.	No comment

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.4 Financial and Human Resources				
	Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment

4.4.3	The budget is inadequate for management needs	Due to the international and national economic crisis, the cultural sector in Portugal suffered budget cuts. As such, the Côa Parque Foundation had a 45% cut which makes it difficult to ensure a continued and effective management of the property.	Ongoing.	Côa Parque Foundation.	It is expected that the current budget issues will be resolved by Portuguese authorities. The answer to this question only applies to the Portuguese side of the property.
4.4.4	Existing sources of funding are not secure	Negotiations are taking place between government agencies and the Côa Parque Foundation to reach a budget compromise for the future.	Ongoing.	Côa Parque Foundation.	It is expected that the current budget issues will be resolved and future funding will be secure. The answer to this question only applies to the Portuguese side of the property.
4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building					
4.6.3	There is a limited education and awareness programme	A Program to reach the local community and schools was created.	Ongoing.	The Côa Parque Foundation on the Portuguese side and Junta de Castilla y León and ADECOCIR on the Spanish side of the property.	Since World Heritage inscription, there has been a continued and active effort to reach the local community.

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

The authenticity of the World Heritage property has been **preserved**

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property is **intact**

5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **maintained**.

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

Other important cultural and / or natural values are being **partially degraded** but the state of conservation of the World Heritage property has not been significantly impacted

5.4. Additional comments on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.4.1 - Comments

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas

Conservation	Positive
Research and monitoring	Positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	No impact
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	Positive
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status

6.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of this Section of the Periodic Report

Governmental institution responsible for the property
Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff

6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable?

yes

6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

The window for text does not have enough space. For example, in section 4.2.1, Decree-Law 117/97 was replaced by Decree-Law 96/2007, which in turn was replaced by Decree-Law 115/2012. The Coa Park Foundation (Decree-Law 35/2009, March 8) was created to manage the Coa Valley Archaeological Park. Law 13/85 was replaced by Law 107/2001, 8 September (laying the foundation of the system of protection of cultural heritage (it can be provided in English). The same applies to Question 4.5.4.

6.6 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire from the following entities

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Good
Advisory Body	Good

6.7 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?

Most of the required information was accessible

6.8 - The Periodic Reporting process has improved the understanding of the following

The World Heritage Convention
The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

6.9 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	Satisfactory

6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

• Geographic Information Table

Reason for update: Buffer zone of Prehistoric Rock Art Sites in the Côa Valley 20543.48ha.

• Map(s)

Reason for update: Updated maps not altering the boundaries of the property are being submitted to substitute those featured above (except Map of Inscribed Property - Siega Verde 2010).

6.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise