

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Blenheim Palace

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

425

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987


1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Blenheim Palace	51.842 / -1.361	0	0	0	1987
Total (ha)			0		

Comment

The property covers 961 hectares

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Map of Blenheim Park	23/12/1986	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Christopher Young
English Heritage
Head of World International Advice
- Paul Blaker
Department for Culture, Media and Sport
Head of World Heritage

Comment

The DCMS representative is now Francesca Conlon, 4th Floor, 100 Parliament St, London SW1A 2BQ; tel +44 (0) 7211 6117; e-mail Francesca.conlon@culture.gsi.gov.uk

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- John Hoy
Blenheim Estate Office
Chief Executive - Blenheim Palace

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
2. [Blenheim Palace](#)
3. [Map of the World Heritage site \(MAGIC Map server\)](#)
4. [Virtual Tour of Blenheim Palace \(BBC - History\)](#)

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

Comment

The following UK designations apply to the WHS: 5 scheduled ancient monuments; 45 listed buildings; all included on English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England at Grade I; Site of Special Scientific Interest within the Park; all designated as a National Heritage property in 1999

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Significance

Blenheim Palace near Oxford was inscribed as a World Heritage Site in 1987 for its architectural importance, as the design and building of the Palace between 1705 and 1722 represented the beginning of a new style of architecture and for its landscaped Park designed by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown which is considered as "a naturalistic Versailles". In tangible form Blenheim is an outstanding example of the work of John Vanburgh and Nicholas Hawksmoor, two of England's most notable architects. Blenheim represents a unique architectural achievement celebrating the triumph of the English armies over the French. Blenheim and its associated Park has exerted great influence on the English Romantic movement which was characterised by the eclecticism of its inspiration, its return to national sources and its love of nature. The original landscape set out by John Vanburgh who regulated the course of the River Glyme was later modified by Lancelot 'Capability' Brown who created two lakes seen as one of the greatest examples of naturalistic landscape design. Blenheim Palace was built by the nation to honour one of its heroes the first Duke of Marlborough and is also closely associated with Sir Winston Churchill. Criterion (ii): By their refusal of the French models of classicism, the Palace and Park illustrate the beginnings of the English Romantic movement which was characterised by the eclecticism of its inspiration, its return to national sources and its love of nature. The influence of Blenheim on the architecture and organisation of space in the 18th and 19th centuries was greatly felt in both England and abroad. Criterion (iv): Built by the nation to honour one of its heroes, Blenheim is, above all, the home of an English aristocrat, the 1st Duke of Marlborough, who was also Prince of the Germanic Holy Roman Empire, as we are reminded in the decoration of the Great Drawing Room by Louis Laguerre (1719–20). In virtue of this criterion, just like the Residence of Wurzburg (included in 1981) and the Castles of Augustusburg and Falkenlust in Brühl (included in 1984), Blenheim is typical of 18th century European princely residences, a category which is still under-represented on the World Heritage List.

Comment

A revised full Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was agreed by the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee in June 2013

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

(ii)(iv)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

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)

No other factors relevant

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact				Origin	
3.1	Buildings and Development						
3.1.1	Housing						
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities						
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure						
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure						
3.3	Services Infrastructures						
3.3.1	Water infrastructure						
3.4	Pollution						
3.4.3	Surface water pollution						
3.5	Biological resource use/modification						
3.5.1	Fishing/collecting aquatic resources						
3.5.3	Land conversion						
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals						
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production						
3.6	Physical resource extraction						
3.6.4	Water (extraction)						
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)						
3.7.7	Pests						
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses						
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						
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage						
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events						
3.10.1	Storms						
3.10.2	Flooding						
3.10.3	Drought						
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events						
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition						
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)						
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species						
3.12.1	Translocated species						
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species						
3.12.3	Invasive / alien freshwater species						
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	restricted	frequent	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.3	Surface water pollution	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.6	Physical resource extraction					
3.6.4	Water (extraction)	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	localised	frequent	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	static
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.1	Translocated species	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	static
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static

Scheduled Ancient Monuments; Registered Historic Park and Garden

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

3.17.1 - Comments

Most negative impacts at Blenheim are minor, well understood by management, and there are systems in place to manage them wherever possible

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is **no buffer zone**, and it is not needed

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 property had **no buffer zone** at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

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 property had **no buffer zone** at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

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

No comments

4.2. Protective Measures

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

County structure plan policies; local plan policies; listed buildings; site of special scientific interest; scheduled ancient monuments; registered historic park and garden; Cotswolds AONB designation on western boundary; national heritage legislation; and ecological legislation.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Tuesday, October 25, 2005

- **Question 6.02**

County Structure Plan Policies; Local Plan Policies; Listed Buildings; Site of Special Scientific Interest;

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?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides an **adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

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?

The property had **no buffer zone** at the time of inscription on the World Heritage List

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?

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides an **adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

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

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

A management plan for the property is in place. Steering group formally set up on 01 October 2004 to guide the preparation of the management plan process. Managed as a private landed estate: this site is owned and managed by the Blenheim Estate who have the primary responsibility for its management. It does, however, operate within national planning legislation as delivered by West Oxfordshire District Council. English Nature provide advice on the SSSI management; the Historic Buildings Inspector at English Heritage, together with the local planning authority Conservation Officer provide advice on management and conservation of listed buildings, and the Countryside Agency advise on issues relating to the national heritage landscape. Levels of public authority who are primarily involved with the management of the site: national (DCMS).

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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


Submitted on Wednesday, October 26, 2005

- **Question 5.02**

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

- **Question 5.03**
Set up date: 2004
Function: to guide the preparation of the management plan process.
Mandate: To provide advice to the Estate and management plan team on all issues relating to the production of the management plan, including decisions on how public consultation should be conducted, what issues the management plan needs to address, how the plan should be formulated including agreement on contents, commenting on draft plans and agreeing on the extent of redrafts, agreeing the final plan to be submitted to State Party for approval.
Constituted: formal
- **Question 5.05**
Overall management system of the site
 - Other effective management system
 - Managed as a private landed estate

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site and National Heritage Management Plan. July 2006.	N/A	Available	01/01/2006	

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 being **fully** implemented and monitored

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	Good
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Not applicable

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 have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in 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 **little or no contact** 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

These answers need to be read in the knowledge that Blenheim Palace is in the single ownership of the Dukes of Marlborough

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

No comments

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)	1%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	9%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	85%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	5%
Other grants	0%

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

Comment

The property has never received any money from the World Heritage Fund

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

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

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

The existing sources of funding are **secure** in the medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding in the long-term

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

There is a **major flow** of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the World Heritage property

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

No comments

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

Full-time	40%
Part-time	60%

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

Permanent	42%
Seasonal	58%

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?

A range of human resources exist, but these are **below optimum** to manage the World Heritage Property.

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

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	Low
Promotion	Medium
Community outreach	Low
Interpretation	Medium
Education	Medium
Visitor management	High
Conservation	Low
Administration	High
Risk preparedness	Medium
Tourism	Medium
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Low

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

No capacity development plan or programme is in place; management is implemented by external staff and skills are not transferred

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

No comments

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 **considerable** research but it is **not directed** towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared with local participants and some national agencies**

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

"John Piper at Blenheim Palace" - Jeri Bapasola - 2012
 "Churchill's Grandmama - Frances, 7th Duchess of Marlborough" - Margaret Forster - 2010
 "The Finest View in England - The Landscape and Gardens at Blenheim Palace" - Jeri Bapasola - 2009
 "Household Matters - Domestic Service at Blenheim Palace" - Jeri Bapasola - 2007
 "Blenheim and the Churchills" - Hugh Montgomery-Massingberd - 2004

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

No comments

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

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 **planned and effective** education and awareness programme that contributes to the protection of the World Heritage property

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?

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is adequately presented and interpreted **but improvements could be made**

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	Adequate
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

No comments

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	Minor Increase
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

Comment

Visitor management documents are not available

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 **effectively managed** and does not impact its Outstanding Universal Value

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 a **substantial 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

No comments

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	Average
Local / Municipal authorities	Average
Local communities	Not applicable
Researchers	Not applicable
NGOs	Not applicable
Industry	Not applicable
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

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

No relevant Committee recommendations to implement

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

No comments

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

No comments

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	
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure						
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	Criteria (ii) and (iv) - both the palace and its setting; and as the home of the Dukes of Marlborough. Attributes affected are special relationship between the important architectural elements and their landscape setting	Transport management studies have been commissioned in the past to consider if traffic flows and parking could be improved	This is an on-going issue which is regularly monitored	On-going	Blenheim Estate and the local highways authority	Ground transport issues have the potential to affect the local community as well as the WHS.
3.6	Physical resource extraction						
3.6.4	Water (extraction)	Criteria (ii) - landscape. Attribute the Vanbrugh/Brown landscape of which the lake is a key element	Essentially outside the control of the estate, extraction of water from the river feeding the lakes being under the control of the Environment Agency	Regularly monitored as part of general management of the park	On-going	Blenheim Estate and the Environment Agency	This is more of a potential problem than an existing one
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	Criteria (ii) - landscape; and (iv) home of the Dukes of Marlborough. Attributes affected - the physical fabric of the buildings and the landscape	The estate are very aware of the potential impact caused by large numbers of visitors and take care to keep this to a minimum. Care of the historic fabric is constant and visitors are excluded in areas where conservation work is needed	Regular and on-going	On-going	Blenheim Estate and all its key stakeholders	Potential impacts of large numbers of visitors to the physical fabric is well known, but also well monitored at Blenheim.
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events						
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition	Criteria (ii) - landscape (lake). Attributes - the Vanbrugh/Brown landscape lake	This issue has recently been addressed through a large de-silting programme	Regular monitoring on-going	On-going	Blenheim Estate and the Environment Agency	The recent work has improved the situation greatly
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species						
3.12.1	Translocated species	Criteria (ii) - landscape. Attributes - the Vanbrugh/Brown landscape	A bio-security plan should be in place to monitor, identify and eradicate any translocated tree diseases, especially Phyophthora ramorum (on larch and oak) and Chalara fraxinea (ash)	Regular, annual checks at the most vulnerable times of year	Annual	Blenheim Estate with the Forestry Commission	Currently problems with imported stock bringing potentially devastating tree diseases is a real issue for historic parklands like Blenheim
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	Criteria (ii) - landscape. Attribute - all that relate to the landscape	Maintain a regular programme of identification and eradication of invasive weed species both on land and in the lake	Regular and on-going	On-going, targeted to the main growing season	Blenheim Estate and Defra	Not a big issue at Blenheim but needs to be monitored as part of good practice management

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

Please select your top management needs in question 4.9 before filling in the summary table.

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 and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

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

5.4.1 - Comments

Blenheim Palace is well conserved and maintained. This process is also monitored regularly through the mechanism of a management plan and regular annual meetings with the key stakeholders.

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

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

No comments

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

External experts

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

No comments

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 concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
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

- **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**
Reason for update: A revised full Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was agreed by the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee in June 2013
- **Geographic Information Table**
Reason for update: The property covers 961 hectares

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

No comments to make