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Historic Centre of Sheki (Azerbaijan)
No 1549 rev

Official name as proposed by the State Party
Historic centre of Sheki with the Khan’s Palace

Location
Sheki city
Azerbaijan

Brief description
The historic town of Sheki is situated in the central North of Azerbaijan along the southern edge of the Greater Caucasian mountain range. Its historic centre, built as a reconstruction of an earlier town after mud floods in 1772, is characterized by a traditional architectural ensemble of houses with high saddle roofs. Located along important historic trade routes, the architecture was influenced by the building traditions of Safavid, Qajar and Russian rule origin. The Khan’s Palace in the north-east of the town as well as the various merchant’s houses reflect the wealth generated by silkworm breeding and trading of cocoons in the late 18th and 19th centuries.

Category of property
In terms of categories of cultural property set out in Article I of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, this is a group of buildings.

In terms of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (July 2015), Annex 3, this is also an inhabited historic town.

1 Basic data

Included in the Tentative List
24 October 2001

Background
This is an originally referred nomination (41 COM, Krakow, Poland). The World Heritage Committee adopted the following decision (41 COM 8B.20):

- Having examined Documents WHC/17/41.COM/8B and WHC/17/41.COM/INF.8B1,
- Refer the nomination of the Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan’s Palace, Azerbaijan, back to the State Party in order to further advance conservation and preservation mechanisms with a view for their better implementation;
- Recommends the State Party to prepare the Action Plan for conservation and preservation of the nominated property in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS;
- Invites the State Party to give consideration to the following:
  a) to strengthen the mandate and resources of the management team, and to revise and adopt the management plan for its further proper implementation,
  b) to strengthen protective measures for the buffer zone to ensure the long-term protection of the wider landscape setting,
  c) to prepare conservation guidelines to ensure future restorations are undertaken utilizing adequate materials and expertise,
  d) to consider the increase of the role of traditional governance structures such as the Council of Elders and the neighbourhood representatives in decision-making and management processes,
  e) to develop a monitoring system focused on both the state of conservation of the nominated property and the implementation of the management plan.

Consultations and Technical Evaluation Mission
ICOMOS consulted its International Scientific Committee on Historic Towns and Villages (CIVVIH) and several independent experts.

An ICOMOS technical evaluation mission visited the property from 4 to 8 July 2016.

Additional information received by ICOMOS
ICOMOS sent a letter to the State Party on 16 October 2016 requesting additional information with regard to the basis of Outstanding Universal Value, the approach towards the Comparative Analysis, the administrative arrangements for the management of the site and future prospects of development control. The State Party responded on 14 November 2016, addressing all issues that ICOMOS requested. These are integrated in the relevant sections below.

An Interim Report was sent by ICOMOS to the State Party on 23 January 2017.

In its evaluation, ICOMOS recommended that the Historic centre of Sheki with the Khan’s Palace, Azerbaijan, should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Following decision 41 COM 8B.20 in 2017 to refer the nomination back to the State Party, additional Information was submitted by the State Party on 30 January 2019. This information is supplementary to the original nomination dossier and addresses some of the recommendations of the Committee. It includes:

- An Action Plan with Texts of Procedures for the “Conservation and Rehabilitation of Historical Centre of Sheki”;
As a revised nomination dossier has not been submitted, and no further mission has been undertaken. The sections in this evaluation report on Description, History and development, Justification of Outstanding Universal Value, Integrity and authenticity, Criteria under which inscription is proposed, Factors affecting the Property, Boundaries, and Ownership, remain unchanged from ICOMOS’s first evaluation.

Date of ICOMOS approval of this report
13 March 2019

2 Description of the property

Description and history

Sheki is located on the southern foot of the Greater Caucasus ridge and is divided into a northern and southern part by the Gurjana River. While its northern and earlier part is situated on higher land, the southern part lies within the river valley. The history of Sheki dates back at least two millennia but the current historic town of Sheki’s oldest structures date to the year 1772. Almost thirty years after the establishment of the Sheki Khanate in 1743, the previous settlement was destroyed by flooding of the river Kish and the city was resettled and built at its new higher ground location at Gurjana River. It is for this reason that the city today appears homogenous in design and architectural style. The nominated area corresponds to the historic core of Sheki and covers an area of approximately 120 hectares. It is surrounded by a buffer zone of 146 hectares.

The historic centre of the relocated Sheki is its citadel in the upper north-east built in 1790 by Huseyn Khan. Within is gated garden areal accessible via two gates lies the Khan’s Palace, which is singled out in the title and concept of this nomination. Built in 1797 during the reign of Mammad Hasan Khan, the palace complex is composed of the Khan’s residence and seat of power, mosque, bath, pantries, stables, barns and other service buildings. The main architectural structure of the Khan’s palace was designed by the Persian architect Haji Zainal Abdul as a two-storey structure with a dominant front of stained glass windows. It is further characterized by artistic decoration, including paintings, stalactite niche decorations and decorated ceilings with floral patterns.

The city surrounding the citadel is located on steep terrain with narrow and often dead-ended roads. One main road, the major trade route, passes through the centre alongside the citadel and creates the key reference point of trading activities. The main trading areas are located along this primary trade route in the vicinity of the Khan’s Palace. The urban fabric is composed of traditional Sheki manor houses. Each of these is enclosed by a high abode wall and consists of a garden within the wall precinct and a brick and timber structured residential building, often placed in the centre of the garden. The houses all have deep verandas, so-called eyvans, facing in southern direction. The garden vegetation indicates the source of wealth of the city. Mulberry trees were the key nutrition for the silkworms bred in Sheki and their cocoons were sold and became source of the city’s wealth. Sheki also became famous for embroidery products, very often silk embroidery.

Besides the manor houses, Sheki’s public buildings encompass religious structures, identified in the urban fabric by the vertical lines of the mosque minarets, public baths and caravanserais. The city appears strikingly green from a distance while from a pedestrian viewpoint it is characterized by adobe brick walls and cobblestone plastered streets. Its overall impression is influenced by architectural language of Safavid and Qajar origin with later features relating to traditions from territories under Russian rule.

The founding date of a settlement under the name of Sheki is unknown but archaeological records date it to approximately 2,700 years of age. At its present location Sheki was constructed in 1772 following the destruction of the earlier Sheki by floods of the river Kish. This occurred approximately 30 years after establishment of the Sheki Khanate in 1743, which is said one of the most influential Khanates in the region. In its new location, the city soon prospered again through the wealth obtained along the trade routes, in particular through sericulture and the trading of cocoons. The Khan’s palace built in 1797 and many manor houses are a direct expression of this wealthy environment.

However, the reign in the palace was short-lived as merely 18 years after its construction the Khanate was abolished by the Russian empire. Throughout the 19th century Sheki remained a feudal trade town with its management transferred by the Russian government to a military commandant. In 1834 a devastating fire destroyed 369 shops and one caravanserai in the central market area. Per historic records of 1836, Sheki was composed of 2,791 houses at the time with a population of 12,586 inhabitants. Sericulture blossomed during this century, especially after Sheki was designated as a centre to strengthen sericulture in Russia. In addition to silk production craftsmanship and trade were further expanded. In the second half of the century Sheki expanded further based on population growth with 17,945 inhabitants recorded in 1852 and 26,286 inhabitants in 1887.

On 5 May 1920 Soviet Power was established in Sheki. All major residential and public buildings as well as facilities for silkworm breeding and silk production were nationalized. In 1928 an additional silk production factory was built, which then allowed for silk production with spinning machines. This draw an influx of labour from the surrounding regions and Sheki expanded yet another time. Multi-storey residential and public houses were built. In the 1980s the traditional bazaar was moved into a new complex for commercial activities.

The historic city was declared an architectural reserve in 1968. Unfortunately, in the late 20th century renovations, which did not comply with adequate international conservation standards, were undertaken, which
negatively impacted the historic urban environment and partially changed its character as a traditional settlement.

**Boundaries**
The nominated property covers approximately 120 hectares of the core of historic Sheki and includes 15 traditional neighbourhoods. In terms of legal protection, this area is smaller than the “Yukhari Bash” State Historical and Architectural Reserve, established in 1967, which de jure protects the property. However, the smaller boundaries cover the relevant elements that express the significance of historic Sheki and appear the best-preserved area of the larger reserve.

The property is surrounded by a buffer zone of 146 hectares. Like the property area, the buffer zone is also part of the “Yukhari Bash” State Historical and Architectural Reserve and enjoys the same level of legal protection. Towards the west, the buffer zone covers the historic neighbourhoods adjacent to the historic core. Upon ICOMOS inquiry whether its extension was sufficient in case of large scale future developments beyond the buffer zone, the State Party assured that high-rise developments could not be permitted due to the seismic activity in the area. ICOMOS notes that in case this regulation would change in view of technological advances, protection of the historic skyline would need to be considered in any future approval procedures.

On the other three sides the buffer zone ends at the foot of the mountain. The nomination dossier indicated that landscape regulations were developed reaching beyond the buffer zone for an area of 72 square kilometres. However, ICOMOS noted that these recommendations were not formalized in any legislative process and accordingly do not constitute a protective mechanism. ICOMOS considers that the forested mountain slope setting is an important feature of the cityscape and, as indicated in the nomination dossier, reflects on the significance of Sheki. It should therefore be formally protected from future development.

In conclusion, ICOMOS considers that the boundaries of the nominated property are adequate in reflecting its significance but that the buffer zone would need to be expanded to protect the wider landscape setting of the property.

**State of conservation**
The Restoration Manual submitted on 30 January 2019 shows that only 4.2% of public and residential buildings survive from the Khan’s period (1748-1819), while 60.3% were constructed during the Russian administration (1819-1920) and 33.4% belong to the USSR period (1920-1990).

The state of conservation of the historic architectural and urban fabric is diverse. According to the nomination dossier out of 2,775 residential houses located in the “Yukhari Bash” State Historical and Architectural Reserve, less than half retain their historical integrity. About a quarter of the remaining architectural structures are either newly built or modified to the extent that their historical basis can no longer be recognized. The Manual reveals that 361 houses (13%) on the site are newly built houses, using new, modern materials and without taking into consideration historical traditions; 315 (11.35%) are fully modified with extensions, while 84 houses (3%) are in a critical condition and mostly abandoned.

Sheki Fortress is well maintained and Sheki Khan’s Palace receives special care as it deserves, but some buildings of Russian period are neglected and need rehabilitation. In principle, the scale of restoration and rehabilitation efforts undertaken within the nominated property in the last five years is impressive. However, restoration works are not always satisfactory as some structures are simply “over-restored”.

**Factors affecting the property**
Rapid economic development of the Republic of Azerbaijan following its independence led to significant development pressures. These are visible mostly in the effects of urban growth and tourism facilitation, which have also affected the historic centre of Sheki. Several hotels built within the historical and architectural reserve do not respect the surrounding architectural volumes and designs. Some of these inappropriate developments or refurbishments are in prominent locations in the very heart of the historic centre, including near the central mosque and palace compound, which exacerbates the situation. Likewise, the setting of the town is disturbed by a few development projects. While the responsible management authority has prepared recommendations for the issuance of decisions on developments in the property and buffer zone, which were signed by the Minister of Tourism and Culture, the elaboration of a master plan for its future conservation and development control remains a crucial need.

Sheki is already a prime destination for domestic tourism and international tourism is on the rise. The above described hotel developments are results of negative tourism impacts which should by no means be repeated in the future. Sheki is also famous for its festivals. Two years ago, an amphitheatre, for the annual music festival and other city events, was constructed to the south-east of the citadel wall, clearly visible as it is located immediately next to the gate accessed from the main street. Although the structure was meant to be portable, it seems to have lasted ever since its first construction and its tarpaulin structures, subsidiary buildings painted in white and poorly designed white fences constitute negative visual impacts to the historic surroundings.

Sheki lies in a seismically active zone and regulations for new construction works require structures that withstand shocks of 8-9 on the Richter scale. Traditional buildings which combine timber and adobe brick structures are well equipped to withstand earthquakes, however, this ability is at times reduced by inappropriate restorations with concrete and other modern materials. Flooding is also a serious risk to the lower sections of the historic centre. When ICOMOS conducted its technical evaluation mission, recent floods had just destroyed a bridge over the Kish
Sheki could not at a national level, even an in-roposed Outstanding -rested mountain slopes might be susceptible to wildfires which could threaten the town.

ICOMOS considers that the main threats to the property are urban and tourist developments as well as earthquakes and floods.

3 Proposed justification for inscription

Proposed justification
The nominated property is considered by the State Party to be of Outstanding Universal Value as a cultural property for the following reasons:

- Sheki, an important historic trade city was influenced by different rulers including Safavids, Qajars and the Russians Empire, which all influenced the features of architecture reflecting wealth of the trade activities;
- The city was the centre of the first and most powerful of a series of Khanates in Caucasus representing a new administrative system in the region;
- The principal economy of Sheki has been based on sericulture and silk production for which the city is a unique example favoured by its climatic condition and morphology.

Comparative analysis
The comparative analysis is drafted to compare the city within (1) its landscape setting, (2) its function as a khanate capital, (3) its architectural representation as a khanate capital and as (4) a settlement characteristic of sericulture. The additional information received at the request of ICOMOS during the first evaluation process added further material on Sheki’s function and role as a major trade centre in its wider regional context.

In terms of the landscape setting it is said comparable to European highland towns such as Sarajevo (Tentative List), Bosnia-Herzegovina, Plovdiv (Tentative List), Bulgaria, or the City of Safranbolu, Turkey, inscribed on the World Heritage List (1994, criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi)) without further qualification as to the specificities or differences of these cities and their respective landscape settings. To compare the function of Sheki as a khanate capital, the authors draw on other khanate capital cities including Shusha, Baku (inscribed on the World Heritage List as the Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah’s Palace and Maiden Tower, Azerbaijan, 2000 under criterion (iv)), Lankaran, Guba, Lankaran, all in Azerbaijan, and Tbilisi (on Tentative List of Georgia). It is concluded by the authors that the palace of the Sheki khanate stands out for its simple ground plan, its rich decoration and wall paintings. ICOMOS considers that in comparing the Qajar elements of the palace architecture, several similar palaces in Iran should have been analysed and discussed. ICOMOS considers that it is not evident how the Sheki Khan’s Palace can be said outstanding within a regional or even global comparison.

Sheki is finally compared in terms of its role as a centre of sericulture for which comparison in the initial nomination is drawn to the Tomioka Silk Mill and related sites, Japan, inscribed in 2014 under criteria (ii) and (iv). ICOMOS noted that the comparison of sericulture was limited solely to the industrial silk production facilities introduced under Russian rule but did not consider the impact of silkworm breeding on the urban typology and architecture of the city. Accordingly, ICOMOS in its request for additional information sought further explanation as to how the urban typology of Sheki could compare to other centres of sericulture.

In the additional information received on 14 November 2016, the State Party elaborated that sericulture in Sheki was more relevant in terms of trade and source of wealth but did not have a distinct impact on the urban and architectural typology. As the sericulture activities were limited to cocoon breeding and raw silk trade, these according to the State Party’s response did not require fundamental structures, which affected the planning structure of the city. ICOMOS therefore considers that Sheki cannot be considered an exceptional architectural or urban testimony in relation to sericulture.

The additional information received at the request of ICOMOS rather suggested that Sheki should be considered an exceptional centre of trade along the north Eastern Silk Road sections. In considering this, ICOMOS noted that according to its thematic study on the Silk Road, Sheki does not seem located along the key branches identified as the likely sections to be considered for World Heritage nomination. In addition, ICOMOS considers that Sheki’s architectural and urban testimony is quite homogenous following its construction in 1772 and hence when compared to much older settlements along the trade routes of the wider region, it shows...
Comparatively few architectural references to cultural and trade exchanges along these trade routes.

ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis does not justify consideration of this property for the World Heritage List.

Criteria under which inscription is proposed

The property is nominated on the basis of cultural criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v).

Criterion (ii): exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;

This criterion is justified by the State Party on the grounds that the historic centre of Sheki exhibits an important interchange of cultural influences over two millennia. Its location on the Great Silk Road and the trade relations Sheki established promoted an exchange of goods and traditions, which had impacts on the architectural design of the town. In particular, its renewal with Qajar influences in the early 19th century and its expansion influenced by Russian architecture in the late 20th century.

ICOMOS considers that while the city was exposed to various cultural influences through the presence of traders, this would apply to any city located along the Great Silk Road or other important trade routes. ICOMOS considers that the architectural features reflect regional influences in line with the political regimes exerting power over the region at the time of construction. Very limited architectural references to an exchange of cultural traditions can be seen beyond these.

ICOMOS further considers that Sheki’s architectural and urban testimony is very homogenous in result of its construction within a few years following the earlier destruction in 1772. This implies that compared to older settlements along the trade routes of the wider region, it has less capacity to illustrate architectural references to cultural exchanges than cities which look back at millennia of trade exchanges along these very trade routes. ICOMOS considers that it has not been demonstrated how the interchange of cultural influences can be seen as outstanding when compared to other cities along important trade routes in the wider region.

ICOMOS considers that this criterion has not been justified.

Criterion (iii): bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;

This criterion is justified by the State Party on the grounds that the urban layout of Sheki provides a testimony to the Sheki Khanate which is said the most powerful khanate in the Caucasus. This is illustrated by the division of the town into neighbourhoods, so-called mahallah, and the architecture of the Khan’s palace and merchant houses.

The nomination also indicates that the architectural testimony of the city illustrates the cultural traditional of silkworm breeding, cocoon trade and the production of embroideries.

ICOMOS considers that the urban typology illustrates clear influences of Islamic city design with clear division into neighbourhoods which have increasingly private character and often dead-end streets. However, ICOMOS reminds that this urban typology is not unique to khanates and has been recognized in exceptional ways in other cities already inscribed on the World Heritage List.

ICOMOS considers that it is not demonstrated that the Sheki khanate produced architectural features or urban layouts which differ distinctly from other cities in the region and therefore could act as an outstanding testimony of khanates as such. ICOMOS further considers that Sheki’s function as a Caucasus khanate capital was rather short-lived and ended after merely 18 years.

With regard to the ongoing tradition of sericulture, ICOMOS considers that it has not been demonstrated how the urban or architectural form can be said a unique testimony to sericultural traditions. ICOMOS in its request for additional information during the first evaluation, asked the State Party to further elaborate how Sheki’s urban or architectural expressions could be considered a unique testimony of the tradition of silkworm breeding. In its response of 14 November 2016, the State Party indicated that the silk production was more essential as a basis of trade in the interlink of historic trade routes than for the urban or architectural testimony. Silk production at Sheki was limited to cocoon rising and sale of raw silk which both did not require special constructions for this purpose.

ICOMOS considers that this criterion has not been justified.

Criterion (iv): be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;

This criterion is justified by the State Party on the grounds that the historic centre of Sheki is an outstanding architectural ensemble which had maintained its urban form since its construction in the late 18th century. The nomination further highlights that the urban and architectural typology is specific to the local building materials and local climatic conditions.

ICOMOS considers that both urban and architectural typology as well as building materials are typical for the wider region and cannot be judged as exceptional examples in Historic Sheki with its Khan’s Palace. While the urban centre is unusual in its homogeneity as a result of the city’s construction in a short span of time, it is by no means an exceptional type of architectural ensemble by typological means as defined under this criterion.
ICOMOS considers that this criterion has not been justified.

Criterion (v): be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;

This criterion is justified by the State Party on the grounds that from ancient times the economy of Sheki was based on sericulture, trade of cocoons and development of related types of handicrafts. This is said to be indicated by the predominance of mulberry trees in the orchards, high house attics and unique architectural adaptations to the local climatic conditions.

ICOMOS considers that silkworm breeding occurred in a number of cities along the Great Silk Road and mulberry trees therefore equally shape other cityscape. It is not demonstrated that functional relations of sericulture are evident in the urban or architectural characteristics of Sheki and ICOMOS considers that these are not demonstrated to be exceptional or outstanding in comparison with the wider region. Therefore, ICOMOS inquired in its request for additional information in which way the urban and architectural fabric can be said a unique response to the local climatic conditions and the functional needs of sericulture.

In its response of 14 November 2016, the State Party added that Sheki lies in a sub humid climate with minute amounts of rainfall in winter and moderate temperatures in summer. These climatic conditions are said ideal for the intensive planting of mulberry trees in the city, and broadleaved forests surrounding the city that feed silkworms and support their relatively short reproduction cycle of cocoons, lasting only 40-60 days. ICOMOS considers that the key response to the climate indicated here, although fully relevant to the processes of silk production, relates to the growth of specific vegetation and not to an architectural response to climatic conditions. ICOMOS therefore considers that the city cannot be considered to meet this criterion.

ICOMOS considers that this criterion has not been justified.

In conclusion, ICOMOS does not consider that any of the criteria or the conditions of integrity and authenticity have been justified.

Integrity and authenticity

Integrity

The property area proposed for the Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan’s Palace is inclusive of all elements reflecting its historic significance. The urban fabric has retained its traditional typology of neighbourhoods and much of the surrounding landscape. However, the landscape setting is affected by a few hotel complexes which have been developed and remains subject to further urban development pressures given that Sheki is surrounded by mountains in three directions and has limited opportunity to expand. Several hotels were also built within the historical and architectural reserve without respecting the surrounding architectural volumes and styles. In addition, these structures were inserted in key urban historic neighbourhoods and, at times, interrupt the functional and visual relations between the historic monuments. In the same manner, several new residential structures do not correspond to the surrounding architectural proportions, materials or designs.

ICOMOS notes that the percentage of historic structures within the property has been significantly reduced over time. A small percentage of architectural structures is in a very vulnerable condition, the majority of which is in a state of being abandoned or out of appropriate use. These structures are faced with challenges of decay, which might further reduce the integrity of the property in the future.

Authenticity

ICOMOS notes that while authenticity of design, structure and to some extent setting has been affected negatively, the city largely retains its urban typology and environment. It is noteworthy that Sheki has retained its traditional mechanisms for property maintenance and community involvement through neighbourhood representatives and a council of elders. A majority of private residences and some public buildings have kept their traditional use and function.

However, several other important information sources of authenticity are lost. ICOMOS observed that past and ongoing structural and surface repairs and restorations do not pay respect to authenticity of material, substance or workmanship and, in several cases, design. These repairs are carried out with inappropriate materials including concrete and cement mixtures instead of traditional brick and adobe materials as well as plaster surfaces. These measures unfortunately change the visual appearance of the town’s streetscape, in particular the repairs of the outer townhouse walls, which are so visually determining the appearance of Sheki to a visitor. In addition, these repairs are likely to reduce the traditional earthquake resilience of the original construction methods. ICOMOS therefore considers that the Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan’s Palace does not demonstrate the qualifying condition of authenticity as required by the Operational Guidelines.

In conclusion, ICOMOS considers that the conditions of integrity and authenticity have been negatively affected by past and recent developments and restorations and are therefore not met.

Evaluation of the proposed justification for inscription

ICOMOS considers that while Sheki was without doubt an important regional centre of trade, value interchange and sericulture, it has not been demonstrated that it surpassed in these aspects other centres along the historic trade
routes in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Functional and architectural features of khanate capitals are preserved in other historic centres and so are exceptional architectural expressions of Safavid and Qajar origin or influence in historic palaces. ICOMOS could not see potential for the Historic Centre of Sheki and the Khan’s Palace to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value at a global level or within the wider geo-cultural region.

Features
The features that convey the value of the property consist of both the overall urban landscape of the nominated area, with its traditional houses and key individual buildings such as the Khan’s Palace, structures associated with silk breeding, and merchants’ houses.

ICOMOS considers that the ability of the features that convey the value of the town has been compromised by past and recent developments and restorations.

4 Conservation measures and monitoring

Conservation measures
In its first evaluation, ICOMOS observed a clear lack of conservation policies and standards for historic Sheki. Several ongoing projects, including the rehabilitation of important merchant houses were not seen as adequate in terms of international conservation standards. For example, in the Dadanoves house, all windows and doors have been replaced without obvious reason, the property has been extended to add new functions, the floor levels were raised, the ceilings were changed and cement mortar and rendering was used in various places. Likewise, restoration of the citadel walls, which due to building material character and seismic zone location need constant repair, is conducted based on extensive use of cement and at times unjustifiable reconstruction of details.

ICOMOS recommended in its previous evaluation that conservation guidelines need to be prepared for each type of historic building and that while this preparation is ongoing, conservation projects need to be consulted by trained specialists to ensure that international conservation standards are being observed. ICOMOS further recommended that such guidelines should be integrated in a conservation master plan into which some of the policies and actions which are highlighted in the nomination dossier can be integrated as preconditions.

The additional information provided by the State Party in January 2019, includes an Action Plan for the Conservation and Rehabilitation of the Historical Centre of Sheki and a Restoration Manual.

The ‘Action Plan’ provides an assessment of the conservation challenges that face the historic town of Sheki and its landscape setting. It is an aspirational document that analyses the conservation threats and challenges but does not provide more than general approaches as to how these might be addressed.

The Restoration Manual is seen as a code of practice for operators involved in the management and recovery of the historic city of Sheki. It analyses architectural, construction and urban typologies, including materials and gardens, and the natural morphology of the city’s mountain setting, and sets out for each the historical forms and structures, what makes them distinctive, degradation factors, and general prescriptions for interventions.

The Action Plan and the Restoration Manual are both very useful resource and guidance documents that could form the basis for the development of planning guidelines and perhaps stronger protection for individual buildings. Currently they have no status nor are formal means of implementation in place.

The historic centre of Sheki and the Khan’s Palace belong to a diverse group of public and private owners. City walls, schools, kindergartens, factories and public offices within the property are registered as state property. The streets, squares, parks, graveyards, river outlets and 6 plots of lands with residential houses are property of the municipality. 5 public buildings are owned by private associations while 4 mosques and 1 madrasa belong to the religious property authority. About 75% of the area of the historical and architectural reserve are privately owned, which includes a factory, newly built hotels, stores and shops and well as residential houses. Given the high percentage of buildings in private ownership, unless some sort of incentives and constraints can be put in place, it is difficult to see how progress will be made. Although the Action Plan states that the ‘participation of private owners [...] must be incentivized by economic rules, guided by plan instruments and controlled by a management System’, how this is done remains to be defined.

In conclusion, ICOMOS considers that the state of conservation of historic Sheki has been affected by new buildings, rehabilitations and extensive restoration works. Although outline conservation guidance has now been prepared, it will be essential that this is translated into formal guidelines and incorporated into the management system, if progress is to be made in transforming the approach to restoration and conservation.

Monitoring
The monitoring arrangements of the property are overseen and implemented by the “Yukhari Bash” State Historical and Architectural Reserve Management Team. Prior to the first proposed nomination dossier, no monitoring exercises had been documented. The present monitoring system is documented in the nomination dossier by means of a monitoring table of so-called indicators, periodicity and the location of records. In its previous evaluation, ICOMOS noted that the so-called indicators were rather areas of activity, many of which had no obvious relation to monitoring and that the general purpose and content of a monitoring system had not been well understood and was not addressed.
ICOMOS recommended that based on capacity building a monitoring system focused on both the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the management plan should be developed.

In its additional information provided in January 2019, the State Party emphasises that the creation of the Center of the Management of Heritage Sites, by the State Tourism Agency, and the involvement of the Ministry of Culture should be seen as reassuring evidence for the proper implementation of the monitoring system.

It is further stated that the modalities for taking forward a monitoring system are set out in the Action Plan. What is set out there is a system for monitoring projects and actions rather than a system for monitoring the property to ensure it maintains its value, which will need to be developed.

In conclusion, ICOMOS considers that in response to the World Heritage Committee’s requests, conservation guidance has now been prepared but it has yet to be translated into formal guidelines and incorporated into the management system, and although modalities have been set out for a monitoring system, these have yet to be implemented and related to the value of the property.

5 Protection and management

Documentation
Since 1967, several heritage inventories were undertaken to cover the historic centre of Sheki. According to the register approved by resolution No. 132 of the Cabinet of Ministers of Azerbaijan Republic on 2 August 2001, 26 single monuments in the historic reserve are also under individual protection. Following the state program adopted in 2013, a new inventory was conducted in the reserve territory. In this, 202 historic buildings were recorded and a proposal for inclusion of these buildings on the register of architectural monuments has been submitted to the Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

Legal protection
The historic centre of Sheki and its Khan’s Palace are protected as the “Yukhari Bash” State Historical and Architectural Reserve under national legislation of the Republic of Azerbaijan entitled Law on the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments. The reserve was designated on 10 April 1998 and is listed under number 470/Q. Per this legislation, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism is mandated as the executive authority for protection and site management.

ICOMOS noted in its first evaluation that on 19 January 2016, the reserve was further promised a National Reserve Status by presidential decree which aimed at increasing management capacity and public investments. The process of approval of this status and the associated “Plan of activities related to the development and protection of historical part of Sheki city”, as a means of implementation of this Presidential Decree by all relevant Ministries was still being finalized. It was supposed to contain a comprehensive list of actions to be implemented between 2016 and 2025. No information has been provided in the additional information received in January 2019 on a Presidential Decree that could confirm National Reserve status.

In the additional information submitted by the State Party on 14 November 2016 at the request of ICOMOS, it was explained that by decision number 382 of 5 October 2016, the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Azerbaijan approved the general rules on assigning special status to cultural institutions. Based upon the above described decision, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism has referred again to the Cabinet of Ministers and it is envisaged to receive the status of national reserve and increase the number of staff and wages accordingly starting from the beginning of 2017.

According to the legislation, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism is required to authorize any restoration, reconstruction or development project within the national reserve. The buffer zone is established in two protection levels, the so-called buffer zone surrounding the property at a distance of up to 200 meters and the much larger zone for terrain control. The buffer zone is legally part of the “Yukhari Bash” architectural reserve, while the zone for terrain control remains without formal legal designation.

In the additional information submitted by the State Party in January 2019, it was confirmed that the buffer zone will get ‘similar advanced level of protection and management’ as the property by the State Tourism Authority. This implies that ‘all protective measures regarding the property are also automatically applied to its buffer zone’. This approach applies to the buffer zone that is part of the Reserve and not the wider zone for terrain control.

The urban development of Sheki is regulated by the Urban Master Plan adopted in 2010. This Master Plan designates the historic part of Sheki as the “Yukhari Bash” State Historical and Architectural Reserve.

The nomination dossier justly refers to the importance of the natural setting of the nominated property and that the forested mountains play important role in perception of the site. This is confirmed in the Restoration Manual which states that the ‘natural morphology of the Sheki is a landscape of great visual impact and ecological support for the city’. For its protection, cooperation has been established with the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources as well as the Sheki Executive Power and the Sheki City Municipality. However, the recommendations issued towards the protection of the landscape do not yet enjoy binding character. The concerned mountain slopes are merely protected by the law on forest, which is very strict and does not allow cutting of the forest and building activity in the forest in general. However, it could be changed or exemptions could be approved by authorities which may not take heritage concerns into consideration. To ensure the protection of authenticity of setting, ICOMOS
Management system

The overall mandate for management processes lies with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the Republic of Azerbaijan. Within the ministry responsibility has been delegated to the administration of the Sheki City “Yukhari Bash” State Historical and Architectural Reserve.

The nomination dossier highlights several challenges which are currently encountered in the management of the reserve. The management team has too limited decision-making powers to ensure that all processes are in line with heritage concerns and, based on its double subordination under the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the Sheki City Executive Power, it also faces difficulties in the smooth implementation of its managerial mandate. Lack of coordination of the two supervising bodies at times leads to contradictory policies for management processes. In addition, the reserve management team lacks shared premises in form of an administration building and is short of skilled staff which could guide good practice in reserve management.

As result of this situation, the management team was focused on the management of the citadel territory and the Khan's Palace. However, even with this context, there were unclear subordinations between the reserve management and museums functioning within the citadel territory. The financial resources of the team were very limited and capacity-building activities were not offered. In its evaluation, ICOMOS considered that while the management team was highly dedicated to its tasks, it should be an urgent priority to strengthen its financial, professional and technical resources, to improve the quality of conservation and management practice. The additional information submitted in January 2019 states the measures for strengthening the management team are “duly reflected in the Action Plan”.

Despite the location of Sheki in a zone of high seismic activity and dangers of serious floods, no comprehensive approach to risk management is at present available. The Management Plan for the property aims to integrate risk preparedness and mitigation measures for development in an emergency plan to strengthen preventive measures against possible disasters, especially earthquake and flooding.

The Action Plan submitted as part of the additional information in January 2019 includes brief details of a two year programme of ‘quick win’ actions to strengthen the management and conservation of the property. These include the creation of the management system, the adoption of the Restoration Manual, Approval of regulations and procedures and Evaluation and approval of a list of projects. Mention is also made of all of this contributing to a Conservation and Regeneration Urban Plan.

A comprehensive management plan was elaborated in the process of preparing the nomination dossier. This plan addresses the main problems and challenges the nominated site faces and offers concise information on general guidelines for its management and integrated conservation referring to relevant international legal and doctrinal documents. The management plan written in English by an international expert in consultation with the local authorities was not yet fully available in Azerbaijani at the time of the ICOMOS technical evaluation visit. ICOMOS observed active processes aimed at its due implementation.

In the additional information submitted in January 2019, it is stated that the Action Plan will contribute towards the implementation of the Management Plan, but it also states that measures for strengthening the management team are reflected in the Action Plan and that those measures will contribute to the completion of the management plan, following which it will be adopted.

Completion of the management plan and its adoption thus still needs to be addressed.

In the additional information presented at the request of ICOMOS, in October 2017, the State Party reported that the Management Committee of the reserve was established under the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and its composition is approved at the level of 19 members representing various institutions. Although in its first evaluation ICOMOS stated that the Committee was considered to operate on a voluntary or honorary basis and no budget has been attributed to its work, in the additional information submitted in January 2019 it is said that the STA as the main agency responsible for the management of the property will have proper financial resources.

Visitor management

Sheki is a well-known tourism destination within Azerbaijan and is famous for its festivals. There are five different festivals every year. The amphitheatre stage integrated in the citadel for the facilitation of these festivals is not compatible with the historic environment. Its design is...
unacceptable as it diminishes the importance of the citadel and indeed hinders due perception of the site. It is necessary to remove the structure and prepare a more compatible proposal, which will be modest in design and at the same time easily portable to reassemble on an annual basis. While basic information leaflets and city guidebooks are available for visitors at the Sheki Khans Palace ticket office, their content is limited in terms of coverage of site values and differs from the emphasis of the nomination dossier. The historic centre lacks signage and interpretation or information boards.

In its first evaluation, ICOMOS considered that while Sheki was without doubt an important regional centre of trade, value interchange and sericulture, it was not exceptional among other historic centres along the historic trade routes in the Caucasus. Likewise, functional and architectural features of khanate capitals are preserved in other historic centres as are exceptional architectural expressions of Safavid and Qajar origin or influence in historic palaces. Moreover, ICOMOS considered that past and on-going structural and surface repairs and restorations had not paid respect to authenticity of material, substance or workmanship and, in several cases, design. In some repairs, inappropriate materials including concrete and cement mixtures had been used, while new architectural developments, predominantly for hotel functions, had not respected the volumes and proportions of the historic architectural fabric. All of this led to the conclusion that integrity and authenticity had been affected by past and recent developments and restorations to such a degree that they could not meet the necessary levels. Thus in its first evaluation ICOMOS concluded that it could not see potential for the Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan’s Palace to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value at a global or wider regional scale.

In response to the request to strengthen the mandate and resources of the management team, it is said that commitments have been made, although no details have been provided.

In response to the request to consider the increase of the role of traditional governance structures such as the Council of Elders and the neighbourhood, it is clear that the Mahalla Elders are already involved and further measures will be taken to extend involvement to other groups.

ICOMOS considers that the protective measures for the wider landscape setting still need to be put in place, that the management plan still needs to be officially adopted and implemented, and that measures proposed to strengthen the mandate and resources of the management team need to be implemented.

6 Conclusion

In its first evaluation, ICOMOS considered that while Sheki was without doubt an important regional centre of trade, value interchange and sericulture, it was not exceptional among other historic centres along the historic trade routes in the Caucasus. Likewise, functional and architectural features of khanate capitals are preserved in other historic centres as are exceptional architectural expressions of Safavid and Qajar origin or influence in historic palaces. Moreover, ICOMOS considered that past and on-going structural and surface repairs and restorations had not paid respect to authenticity of material, substance or workmanship and, in several cases, design. In some repairs, inappropriate materials including concrete and cement mixtures had been used, while new architectural developments, predominantly for hotel functions, had not respected the volumes and proportions of the historic architectural fabric. All of this led to the conclusion that integrity and authenticity had been affected by past and recent developments and restorations to such a degree that they could not meet the necessary levels. Thus in its first evaluation ICOMOS concluded that it could not see potential for the Historic Centre of Sheki with the Khan’s Palace to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value at a global or wider regional scale.

Such an assessment is largely shared in the new Action Plan which was submitted as part of the additional information by the State Party in January 2019. This states that ‘New buildings have been built on the territory of core and buffer zone over the last years and they cause damage to the original historical appearance of the historical town since they do not correspond to traditional buildings on a scale and style or fundamentally wrong located’ and ‘the scale and shape of the buildings has changed the traditional landscape’.
And in respect of historic buildings, the Action Plan further states that ‘Some historic buildings are adapted and used without compliance with initial designation and the laws of monuments conservation’ and this issue is especially critical in respect of houses which are privately owned, and therefore their owners have to restore or repair them. The owners of these houses either often use modern materials which do not correspond to the materials used in the historical building, or do not have funds for repair’. And in terms of use “the neighbourhoods have lost their historical function, their subdivision into craft, ethnic and morphological districts”. Moreover, the introduction of new buildings and the lack of development control has had equally problematic impacts: ‘Construction is chaotic on the right side of the Gurjana River. Piedmont landscape reveals all the shortcomings of the non-scheduled construction of the new and non-traditional additions to existing traditional houses. Built-up density violates the centuries, old structure of the house garden’.

As ICOMOS always aims to recommend what is in the best interests of conservation, in its first evaluation it added recommendations on conservation, management, capacity building and the protection of setting. These were not pre-conditions for inscription, but rather what was needed to allow the town of Sheki to be better conserved as a place of national and local interest.

The work undertaken by the State Party since the last World Heritage Committee session to address these recommendations (which were adopted by the Committee) in preparing the Action Plan and Restoration Manual is to be commended as a start to halting the current inappropriate restoration practices, to putting in place appropriate planning and other policies to encourage owner participation in the sympathetic regeneration of the town, and to control development. The Action Plan and the Restoration Manual are useful resource and guidance documents that could form the basis for the development of planning guidelines and perhaps stronger protection for individual buildings, if they are given status, and if formal means of implementation are put in place.

Future work on restoration and conservation cannot reverse or mitigate the damage that has already taken place to the historic fabric and urban layout. What can be done is to try and ensure that what remains of the historic fabric is restored in ways that are sensitive, and also provide usable and harmonious buildings. Similarly, if stronger development control measures are put in place, these could limit further damage to what remains of the historic urban layout. However, such measures would probably not be sufficient to alter ICOMOS’s overall assessment of the value of the historic town and its potential to justify Outstanding Universal Value.

In this regard, ICOMOS notes that Decision 41 COM 8B.20 (2017), which referred back this nomination to the State Party, focused exclusively on “further advance conservation and preservation mechanisms with a view for their better implementation.”

Accordingly, as described above, the additional information submitted by the State Party in January 2019 concerns only the management and protection of the property. No new information related to the potential significance of the property has thus been provided.

To be noted is that between 2017, where Decision 41 COM 8B.20 to refer back the nomination was adopted, and 2019, where the additional information on the management and protection was submitted by the State Party, there was Decision 42 COM 8, adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2018. This decision, regarding the referral procedure, considered that: “in compliance with the Convention and the Operational Guidelines, Outstanding Universal Value is recognised at the time of inscription of a property on the World Heritage List and that no recognition of Outstanding Universal Value is foreseen prior to this stage”.

ICOMOS thus has not been in a position to reassess the potential significance of the property nor to reconsider the recommendation of its first evaluation, as no additional information on this aspect of the property had been requested nor received.

ICOMOS considers that this referred back nomination demonstrates the need to further review and clarify the referral back procedure and its application as decided by the World Heritage Committee at its last session.

7 Recommendations

Recommendations with respect to inscription

Noting that no new information related to the potential significance of the property has been submitted which would have allowed ICOMOS to reassess this aspect of the property, ICOMOS reiterates its first recommendation and recommends that the Historic centre of Sheki with the Khan’s Palace, Azerbaijan, should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.
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**Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene**  
(*Italy*), No 1571rev

**Official name as proposed by the State Party**  
*Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene*

**Location**  
Province of Treviso  
Veneto Region  
Italy

**Brief description**  
Located in the northern area of the Province of Treviso, in the Veneto Region, the *Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene* comprises a portion of the vineyard landscape of Conegliano Valdobbiadene Prosecco Superiore DOCG appellation wine production area. The landscape is characterised by hogback hills, small vineyards on steep inclines established on narrow grassy terraces called ciglioni, creating a mosaic patterning or patchwork of forests, small settlements and vineyards, all combining to provide spectacular views. The landscape has formed through centuries of settlement and land use in this remote and rugged land, including viticulture based on the Glera grape variety, and the rise of Prosecco sparkling wines. Careful management of water, forest management, the high vines system (known as beilussera) and techniques to control erosion have also contributed to the distinctive characteristics of the landscape.

**Category of property**  
In terms of categories of cultural property set out in Article I of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, this is a site.

In terms of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (July 2017) paragraph 47, it is nominated as a cultural landscape.

**1 Basic data**

**Included in the Tentative List**  
5 October 2010

**Background**  
This is a referred back nomination. The 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee identified the purposes of referring the nomination back to the State Party as follows:

---

**Decision 42 COM 8B.31:**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B, WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1, and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B4,

2. Refers the nomination of *Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene*, Italy, back to the State Party, taking note of a potential of the proposed property to meet criteria (iv) and (v) to:
   1. Redefine the nomination refocusing the potential Outstanding Universal Value on criteria (iv) and (v),
   2. Redefine the boundaries and buffer zones of the nominated property,
   3. Completing the adoption process by the 28 concerned municipalities of the tool “Technical rule – Articolo Unico”, which was already approved by the Veneto Region in January 2018;

3. Takes note that the general state of conservation of the site is adequate and that the adopted measures of conservation are generally effective, its monitoring and management systems are well-conceived and structured, and the funding commitments by the relevant local authorities are to be saluted;

4. Commends the State Party for the structured governance process to ensure cooperation among all public and private actors involved in the site management as well as for the commitment expressed by the territorial authorities to increase cooperation for the valorisation, protection and preservation of the nominated property;

5. Recommends the State Party, in dialogue with ICOMOS, to implement the above-mentioned recommendations.

As recommended by the World Heritage Committee, discussions between ICOMOS and the State Party commenced in July 2018, and an ICOMOS Advisory Mission took place from 10 to 14 September 2018. The report of the ICOMOS Advisory Process was finalised in 31 October 2018.

In order to address the requirements of the World Heritage Committee, the ICOMOS Advisory process focused engagement with the State Party on four key tasks:

- Reconceptualise the nomination dossier with special focus on the features of a rural landscape, clearly identifying the attributes and values that contribute to its landscape character and emphasising the interrelationship of the contributing elements, and the resulting potential Outstanding Universal Value,
- Provide a discussion on the State of Conservation of the landscape, and specifically address the authenticity and integrity of the attributes as they contribute to Outstanding Universal Value,
- Expand the comparative analysis to reflect the reconfigured nomination,
- Consider the reconfiguration of the dossier and the rationale needed for its boundaries (nominated area and buffer zone) with regard to Integrity and management purposes.

A revised nomination dossier was submitted for evaluation on 29 January 2019.
Date of ICOMOS approval of this report
13 March 2019

2 Description of the property

Note: The nomination dossier and additional information contain detailed descriptions of this property, its history and its state of conservation. Due to limitations on the length of evaluation reports, this report only provides a short summary of the most relevant aspects.

Description and history
The State Party has explained that it has revised the description section of the nomination dossier (Chapter 2). The description is based on: the geographical characteristics of the site; the interaction between people and nature; the history and development of the area (modified to reflect the revised boundary); and the attributes of the revised nomination (which is a new section 2.d). The work on the attributes is a specific response to the ICOMOS Advisory process report. The ingenuity of the farmers, the way people have adapted viticulture to harsh terrain, the mosaic of different land parcels interlinked with woods and the distinct chequerboard pattern of the ciglioni have been clearly outlined.

New archival and bibliographic research has been conducted to support this text, particularly in relation to the ciglioni and mosaic aspects of the vineyards, and the bellussera system of training the vines. This research has underlined that the changes in cultivation techniques in the landscape of the revised buffer zone have not affected the property area, which retains characteristics that have been relatively stable over the past two centuries.

Located in the northern area of Treviso Province, in the Veneto Region, the Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene is located within the vineyard landscape of Conegliano Valdobbiadene Prosecco Superiore DOCG (Denominazione di Origine Controllata e Garantita) appellation wine production area. The geomorphology is characterised by steep ‘hobbacks’ (long ridge with steep sides) at the foothills of the Alps. The nominated property comprises a diverse patchwork of vineyards, historic structures, hilltop villages and settlements (including cottages, farmhouses, stone stables, farm buildings), rural and natural areas.

The revised nomination materials focus on the distinctive characteristics of the landscape, including:

- Small vineyards on steep inclines established on narrow grassy terraces called ciglioni;
- Distinctive geometric patterning of the vineyard layouts as a method of erosion control, and the training of the high vines referred to as the bellussera method;
- Management techniques adapted to this steep landscape still carried out by hand;
- Intermixing of wooded areas and vineyards into a distinctive landscape mosaic; and
- Skilful management of the water supply.

The revised property boundary is considered by the State Party to be the ‘heart of the highest quality production of Prosecco wine’. There are also similar vineyards in the buffer zone, but these do not occur within the same distinctive hogback topography and ciglioni of the revised nominated property area.

The beginnings of Veneto viticulture date back to around 181 BC when the Roman army passed through eastern Veneto on their way to the colony of Aquileia, and the history of viticulture in the wider region has been outlined by the State Party. The earliest documentation concerning the cultivation of the Glera grape variety in the Veneto region dates back to 1754. In the 18th century, cultivation of Glera expanded throughout the hills of Veneto and Friuli. The 19th century is marked by the phylloxera outbreak and the development of a dense network of small and medium-sized farms, which survived until the later 20th century.

The first wine maps for the hills of Conegliano and Valdobbiadene date to around 1870. However, the area under vines that for the large part matches that of the originally nominated property, was clearly shown for the first time on maps drawn up in 1936. The State Party further highlights that the wine typically produced in the nominated area is the Conegliano Valdobbiadene Prosecco Superiore DOCG, which accounts for less than one-fifth of all Prosecco production. The recent dramatic increase of Prosecco supply relates mostly to the Prosecco DOC, which is a very much larger area that covers much of the Veneto and Friuli Provinces. In 2013, more than 300 million bottles of sparkling wine was produced in the Prosecco DOC based on highly mechanised and industrialised methods, and the production levels have continued to grow.

In 1962 a group of 11 producers, representing the principal vine-growers’ cooperatives and the major sparkling wine-producing companies, founded the Consorzio di Tutela del Prosecco di Conegliano Valdobbiadene, proposing a set of production regulations to safeguard the quality and image of the wine they made. Subsequently, in 1966 the first Italian wine route, Strada del Vino Bianco (renamed Strada del Prosecco e Vini dei Colli Conegliano-Valdobbiadene in 2003), was created in this area. The importance of Prosecco has increased since 1969 when it obtained the certification DOC (Denominazione di Origine Controllata).

In 2003, through the regional law that regulates Production Districts, the Conegliano Valdobbiadene territory was recognised as the first oenological district of the Veneto Region. This recognition was crucial for gaining the DOCG certification (Denominazione di Origine Controllata e Garantita) for Conegliano Valdobbiadene in August 2010.
In the middle of the 20th century, depopulation was a determining factor in the decline of viticulture, leading to the abandonment of inaccessable vines in the wider area and increased forest cover. There has been a revival in the central region in recent decades due to the commercial success of Prosecco.

Recent vineyards in the larger area have not always been established and managed according to traditional methods (such as planting parallel to the slope), and landslides have occurred. In the flatter southern part and in the hilly areas, where the conditions were favourable, the vineyards were developed using machinery. The landscape outside the revised nominated property has become a wine-producing area on an industrial scale.

**Boundaries**
The previous nominated area was similar to the designation of the Conegliano Valdobbiadene Prosecco Superiore DOCG vine growing area, and covered an area of 20,334.20 ha. The State Party has substantially revised the boundaries, based on the decision of the World Heritage Committee and ICOMOS advisory process. The property now consists of an area of 9,197.45 ha, focused on the hogback vineyard areas as the landscape most able to meet the requirements of authenticity. The delineation of the boundary is based on natural features and valleys that separate the hills from the pre-Alps to the north, the Piave River to the west and the bottom of the foothills to the Po Valley to the southeast. The State Party has presented a single property, rather than breaking it into parts as a serial proposal.

The buffer zone comprises an area which also contains vineyards, but these are at a lower elevation, with more rural settlements and other architectural monuments. The single buffer zone of 9,789.80 ha is significantly reduced from the previous proposal of 23,654 ha. In reducing the buffer zone, the State Party’s has excluded areas that were not as coherent in relation to the history and landscape of the nominated property. In general, ICOMOS agrees that the revised buffer zone is more heterogeneous in its characteristics than the revised property area.

The State Party has also identified a ‘Commitment Area’ which is beyond the buffer zone. The size of this area is not indicated, but it is similar to the large buffer zone boundary in the previous nomination. This area contains the forest pre-Alpine flank to the north, the main historic towns, and intensive viticulture areas to the west, south and east. The municipalities in this larger area have joined the Memorandum of Understanding with the Veneto Region in relation to regulations for planning and protection of the wider landscape. The northern parts of the Commitment Area are sparsely populated, and are important to the larger visual setting and ecosystem services to the nominated area.

**State of conservation**
Based on the distinctive character and the persistence of the ‘mosaic’ character of the landscape over several centuries, the State Party considers that the revised nominated property demonstrates a good state of conservation. The State Party highlights the state of conservation of the geomorphological components of the landscape, the agro-biodiversity, the architectural and settlement elements, and the vineyards and ciglioni.

While ICOMOS concurs with much of the general conclusions reached in the additional material submitted, the condition assessment is not sufficiently detailed to provide a basis for future monitoring and management. As discussed below, there are a number of elements which currently suffer from a poor state of conservation (particularly buildings and vernacular architecture in the property and buffer zone). A detailed and systematic assessment and monitoring of the state of conservation of the attributes of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value is recommended as a priority.

**Factors affecting the property**
The State Party has explained that this section of the nomination dossier required only minor revisions from the original proposal, in order to reflect the changed boundary of the proposed property. The revised nomination suggests that the most important factors affecting the nominated property are related to development pressures, particularly the transformation of the agricultural landscape due to urban development and the mechanisation of vineyard labour. Urban development had a particular impact on the landscape between the 1960s and the global financial crisis in 2008. However, the State Party considers that the Regional Laws 11/2004 and the establishment of city plans for each of the municipalities in the region have allowed this type of pressure to be managed more effectively. In addition, the Regional Law n. 14 of June 2017 has provided a greater degree of landscape protection, including cultivated biodiversity.

ICOMOS considers that the revised nominated property and its buffer zone continue to be affected by some areas of low quality urbanism, infrastructure development, and the poor condition of architecture, monuments and settlement areas, particularly in the buffer zone. Future wind and solar power installations in the buffer zone could also create a detrimental impact on the integrity of the setting of the property.

The substantial increase in the production of Prosecco is based on the larger area of the Prosecco DOC (which comprises almost all of the Veneto and Friuli Venezia Giulia regions), aided by the industrialisation of production. However, the nominated area is a very small portion of this wine region, and the production of wine is primarily the Conegliano Valdobbiadene Prosecco Superiore DOCG, which accounts for a small portion of the Prosecco produced overall.
Global climate change has increased the incidence of heavy rain events, surface erosion, landslides and heavy runoff. The State Party acknowledges the need for improved drainage infrastructure to respond to these pressures. It has provided a summary of mitigation interventions undertaken over the past two decades. These include inter-row grassing, avoiding rittochino systems in the steepest areas (drainage ditches dug between the rows of vines), maximum row lengths and terrace widths, conservation of hedges, and various works to establish ditches and drainage.

Tourism does not currently pose significant pressures within the nominated area, although the number of visitors to the area is expected to increase following a potential World Heritage inscription.

ICOMOS considers that the main factors affecting the nominated property are urban development and expansion, agricultural transformations, landslides and demographic and socio-economic shifts. ICOMOS also notes that poor quality infrastructure, industrial constructions and settlements in the buffer zone have had a detrimental impact on the setting (affecting the tourism appeal of the property itself); and that there are some buildings in the property and its buffer zone in poor condition.

3 Proposed justification for inscription

Proposed justification

The State Party has revised the proposed justification for Outstanding Universal Value, and the criteria proposed has been reduced to one (criterion (v)).

The nominated property is considered by the State Party to be of Outstanding Universal Value as a cultural property for the following reasons:

- The rural landscape, which dates back to the 17th century, and demonstrates adaptation to a steep ridge landscape or hogback morphological system, creating a specific micro-climate and dramatic scenery;
- The vineyards based on Glera have been established in the grassy terraces on the steep slopes, known as ciglioni, and demonstrate the ingenuity of the farmers (including the careful management of water resources and erosion);
- The sustainable ecological processes of the evolved and continuing land uses of the landscape have contributed to its distinctive characteristics. They also demonstrate the historical and continuing interactions between local communities and their natural environment;
- Farming in small plots has contributed to a mosaic (or ‘chequerboard’) patterning that also includes forests and small settlements.

Comparative analysis

The State Party has revised the comparative analysis based on the revised conceptualisation of the revised attributes and boundary of the nominated property. Much of this work has been aided by the report of the ICOMOS Advisory Process. The comparative analysis has been reworked according to three attributes (each of which has several sub-attributes). These are a) the geomorphology (the average height above sea level, the steepness of the slopes, and the geographical character); b) the ingenuity of growers (the agrarian management techniques, especially with regard to measures to contain erosion and the techniques of vine breeding and training); and c) the landscape mosaic (the size and orientation of patches, type and origin of design).

Based on this revised framework, the comparative analysis has been rewritten. The main focus of this analysis has been on European sites and landscapes of rural wine-making. An initial comparison with 37 landscapes has been made, including properties in the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists, and others that have been identified from national and international registers and lists. This first stage of the analysis identified a smaller set of five potentially comparable properties for which a deeper analysis was undertaken. These were: Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the Islands (Italy, criteria (ii), (iv), (v), 1997); Alto Douro Wine Region (Portugal, criteria (iii), (iv), (v), 2001), Priorat-Montsant-Siurana paysage agricole de la montagne méditerranéenne (TentativeList, Spain, criteria (v), (vi)); Cultural Landscape of the Serra de Tramuntana (Spain, criteria (ii), (iv), (v), 2011); and the Vineyard Landscape of Piedmont: Langhe-Roero e Monferrato (Italy, criteria (iii), (v), 2014).

Based on this analysis, the State Party concludes that the revised nominated property represents a model of a rural landscape that is not otherwise represented in the World Heritage List.

ICOMOS considers that the work undertaken by the State Party to focus the nominated area on the hogback landform (rather than the Prosecco DOC area), together with the substantial changes to the justification for Outstanding Universal Value and the proposed attributes has allowed a much improved framing of the comparative analysis. Based on the exchanges during the ICOMOS advisory process, a number of unconvincing or too-general bases for the comparative analysis have been removed, and the framing has been sharpened to be able to demonstrate the potential contribution of this landscape within its geocultural context. As ICOMOS noted in its previous evaluation, a number of aspects of European viticultural landscapes are already represented in the World Heritage List, but that there are historical and physical contexts and adaptations where gaps potentially remain. The specific land use practices that include forest and water management as well as the localised agricultural and viticultural adaptations to this challenging terrain are therefore central; as are the specificities and practices such as the high vine bellussera techniques.
which combine to create the distinctive characteristics of this landscape. ICOMOS therefore considers that the substantial revisions to the proposal, the tighter and more coherent boundary, and the re-framing of the comparative analysis provide a sound basis for the further consideration of this property.

ICOMOS considers that the revised comparative analysis justifies consideration of this property for the World Heritage List.

Criteria under which inscription is proposed
Although the original nomination was presented on the basis of criteria (iv) and (v), the revised proposal is nominated on the basis of cultural criterion (v) alone.

Criterion (v): be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;

This criterion is justified by the State Party on the grounds that the revised nominated property is an outstanding example of a viticulture landscape, based on the specific characteristics of the hogback geomorphology, which has been inhabited and farmed for centuries. The nominated landscape is a result of transformations that occurred from the 17th century. This system of viticulture continues today, including manual management of the fragile ciglioni – grassy terraces that follow the land contours of the steep slopes. This system of viticulture gives the landscape its strong characteristics, including the ‘chequerboard’ appearance with high perpendicular rows of vines, the complex agricultural patchwork of vineyards and scattered rural settlements, interspersed with forests and other vegetation. The State Party also refers to the bellussera system that developed from about 1880 for training the vines. Also relevant is the long history of sharecropping in this area, which is still reflected in the landscape through the small size of properties and the mosaic landscape of cultivated areas.

ICOMOS considers that the revised justification for criterion (v) and the decision to discontinue the proposal in light of criterion (iv) have strengthened the justification for Outstanding Universal Value. In its previous evaluation, ICOMOS noted that the practices of viticulture in steep landscapes and the manual management of the vines are not unique characteristics in the geo-cultural context. However, the State Party has deepened the specificities of the landscape, focusing on the means by which it demonstrates the centuries of interaction of human settlement and land use (particularly wine growing) in this specific topographical context. ICOMOS also considers that the landscape could be vulnerable to irreversible change due to the pressures of production of Prosecco within a growing global market.

Integrity and authenticity
Integrity
The integrity of the revised nominated property is based on the ability of the nominated area to convey the potential Outstanding Universal Value. The intact nature of the nominated area and its relevant features (including consideration of the adequacy of the boundary), the state of conservation and the way major pressures are managed are also determinants of integrity.

The State Party considers that the nominated area can represent the processes that have created the distinctiveness of the landscape. Various factors have been identified by the State Party that have affected the property over time (such as war, economic crises and emigration), as well as the historical impacts on European viticulture (including plant diseases). Despite these changes, the landscape of the revised nomination has retained many of its attributes, especially the vineyards and ciglioni, the small settlements and the forests. The agricultural and viticultural techniques have also been maintained over time.

ICOMOS considers that the revised boundary has improved the integrity of the nominated property as the original boundary was largely based on the DOCG appellation delimitation granted in 2010, reflecting a large area that was not delineated until the early 20th century. The areas that were considered to weaken the integrity of the original nomination have been excluded, and are now within the buffer zone and the wider ‘Commitment Area’. The revised boundary contains the areas of the hogback landforms, the distinctive ciglioni terracing and landscape mosaic of interwoven vineyards and forested areas.

Authenticity
The authenticity of the property is based on the identification of the elements of the agricultural and viticultural system, including the hogback formations, vineyards, settlements and the ciglioni. The history of the ciglioni has been documented back to the 17th century; and the ‘mosaic landscape’ based on sharecropping system can be traced back to the 18th century. The various buildings and monuments can also be seen to represent the historical periods that have contributed to the characteristics of the nominated landscape and its buffer zone. The State Party also notes the landscape was included in some religious paintings, such as those by Giovanni Battista Cima da Conegliano in the second half of the 15th century.

In its previous evaluation, ICOMOS raised concerns that weakened the authenticity of this property, based on the insufficiently well justified attributes within a much larger nominated area. Clearly, significant changes have occurred to the landscape, particularly during the 20th century. However, the deepened documentation of the history of the ciglioni and the ‘mosaic’ landscape, the revisions made to the justification for Outstanding Universal Value, the reduced boundary that follows the
hogback landform, and the focus on criterion (v) has strengthened the ability for the authenticity to be demonstrated, despite many past and current challenges.

ICOMOS notes that the attributes of the rural landscape are recorded in the archives of the Veneto Region. Despite many changes, the continuity of the vineyard areas and the complexity of the hilly agricultural patchwork in the revised nominated area is established. The integral relationship between the natural and cultural systems is a component of the authenticity, and have created a distinctive sense of place.

In conclusion ICOMOS considers that while many changes have occurred over the past centuries and various challenges remain, the revised nominated property meets the requirements of integrity and authenticity.

**Evaluation of the proposed justification for inscription**

ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis justifies the consideration of this nominated property for the World Heritage List. The revised proposal has the potential to demonstrate an Outstanding Universal Value, in relation to criterion (v) and meets the requirements of authenticity and integrity.

**Attributes**

The State Party has revised the proposal according to three attributes: geomorphology, the ingenuity of farmers, and the landscape mosaic. Sub-attributes have been identified for each of these, and include: geomorphology (the average height above sea level, the steepness of the slopes, and the geographical character); ingenuity of growers (the agrarian management techniques, especially with regard to measures to contain erosion and the techniques of vine breeding); and landscape mosaic (the size and orientation of patches, type and origin of design).

ICOMOS notes that this is an area where significant improvements have been made by the State Party, based on the exchanges during the ICOMOS advisory process. The previous proposal listed a large array of attributes, many of which seemed of limited relevance to the proposed justification for Outstanding Universal Value. ICOMOS considers that this revised focus has been helpful in reframing the comparative analysis (as discussed above), but that a more comprehensive identification, inventory and mapping of the attributes is needed. The attributes that potentially represent the proposed values of the property include a complex interplay of natural and cultural elements, notably: the hogback landforms and steep slopes, the small vineyards established with the narrow grassy terraces known as ciglioni, the distinctive geometric patterning of vineyard layouts, the implementation of the bellussera high vine training method, vineyards managed by hand, intermixing of wooded areas and vineyards that creates a landscape ‘mosaic’, small areas of forest (important for hydrology and erosion control), the water supply system, and the small settlements and their vernacular structures.

ICOMOS considers that the revised nominated property is supported by a relevant comparative analysis, demonstrates criterion (v), and meets the requirements of authenticity and integrity. Further work on the mapping and identification of attributes is needed.

**4 Conservation measures and monitoring**

**Conservation measures**

The conservation of the nominated cultural landscape is a complex undertaking, due to the interplay between the tangible attributes, natural processes and the socio-economic arrangements that support the continuing land management processes. The conservation measures are not systematically detailed in the revised nomination dossier, although the mechanisms established through the systems of protection are well described. ICOMOS anticipates that once the management plan is fully elaborated, it should include clear conservation objectives associated with the attributes of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value, and a programme of implementation.

**Monitoring**

The State Party has explained that this section of the dossier required only minor revisions from the original proposal, in order to reflect the changed boundary of the proposed property.

The property has several monitoring systems, overseen by different institutions in the fields of traditional management of land and agriculture, nature conservation and monuments. As part of the property's Management Plan, a set of indicators has been defined. The monitoring system has been designed by existing instruments according to the seven strategic objectives and actions identified in the Management Plan.

ICOMOS considers that the monitoring system has been well conceived, although there is a need to identify some additional indicators for the assessment of the state of conservation and the biodiversity of the property, and to define the periodicity of measurement of the indicators.

**5 Protection and management**

**Documentation**

Documentation in the form of current and historical maps, data concerning land uses, vineyards and wine production (based on the AVEPA vineyard register), and an inventory of photographs and other relevant materials have been
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provided by the State Party. In addition, there is information about two projects focusing on the plant biodiversity of the Conegliano-Valdobbiadene DOCG by the Biology Department at the University of Padua.

ICOMOS notes that some aspects of the documentation of the landscape lack clarity in the revised dossier, including the precise mapping of attributes (particularly buildings and small settlements). Furthermore, ICOMOS considers that the flora and fauna of the nominated area could be more fully inventoried. ICOMOS also believes that additional historical data on the evolution of the relationship between forest management and agriculture/viticulture would usefully contribute to the understanding of the evolution of the landscape over time, as well as enhancing the management strategies for sustaining the cultural landscape in light of future changes to the climate and socio-economic contexts.

Because of the significant changes to the nomination dossier made by the State Party, it is not always clear whether the text that outlines the documentation of the elements within the property (such as architectural monuments, urbanised areas and art) applies to the property area or the buffer zone. This should be rectified as a priority.

Legal protection
The State Party has explained that this section of the dossier required no revisions from the original proposal, given that the same arrangements apply, and were considered adequate by the World Heritage Committee.

The property is protected at national, regional, provincial and municipal levels, as well as through the implementation of European environmental laws. The implementation of the constitutional protection of the landscape in Italy is governed by the Codice dei Beni culturali e del paesaggio (Cultural Heritage and Landscape Code) issued by Legislative Decree No. 42, 22 January 2004, and amendments: 2006 Legislative Decrees No. 156 and 157; and 2008 Legislative Decrees No. 62 and 63. This legal framework is administered by the Ministry for Cultural Heritage and its regional agencies, and defines the responsibilities of the regional and local public authorities. At the regional level, the main reference regulation is established by the Regional Law 11, 23 April 2004 concerning regulations for the territorial government and landscapes matters, as amended by the subsequent Regional Law of 26 May 2011.

ICOMOS considers that this set of protective measures is adequate, although it could be strengthened by the implementation of the Detailed Landscape Plan (Piano Paesaggistico di Dettaglio) (PPD) at the regional level, and the implementation of Intermunicipal regulation of rural police (Regolamento intercomunale di polizia rural).

Several key plans are established by the framework of legal protection. The first is the Regional Land Plan for the Veneto Region (PTRC - Piano Territoriale Regionale di Coordinamento), a regional instrument for the governing of the territory, and applies to the nominated property and buffer zone. It outlines the objectives in line with the guidelines for the provincial socio-economic development of landscapes. In 2018, revision of this plan was underway. The other is the municipal and inter-municipal level Piani di Assetto del Territorio which constitutes the planning tools that regulate and control building and renovation permits.

Currently, the establishment of vineyards is regulated in detail in different municipalities. AVEPA (Agenzia Veneta per i Pagamenti in Agricoltura) keeps the register of vineyards and oversees their management, including the requirements for the establishment of new vineyards. The property is also protected at the national level by the regulations and orders introduced since 1967 relating to guaranteed controlled appellation wines (DOCG). The Denomination of Controlled and Guaranteed Origin Conegliano Valdobbiadene Prosecco Superiore DOCG regulations constitute a legal instrument that regulates the production of DOCG wine. The production rules of the DOCG determine, among other things, the planting system, the organisation and management of vineyards, the protection of biodiversity and the materials that can be used to build wine-making facilities. However, ICOMOS notes that not all farms are part of this regulatory arrangement.

A Memorandum of Understanding between the Veneto Region and the municipalities of the Prosecco wine production area was approved in Regional Council Resolution No. 561, 26 April 2016. It establishes a shared regulation to be included in the local city planning and/or building codes in order to ensure improved valorisation and protection of the nominated property.

In order to improve and better coordinate across the Municipalities of the Prosecco wine region, the State Party has devised the ‘Technical rule - Sole Article’ which was developed through collaboration between 28 municipalities over a period of almost two years. This was approved by the Region in January 2018. This is an urban regulation to introduce more specific rules for the nominated property and the buffer zone, and requires the involvement of all municipalities involved in the 2016 Memorandum of Understanding. ICOMOS considers that this strengthens the coordination of management.

Management system
The State Party has explained that this section of the dossier required no revisions from the original proposal, given that the same arrangements apply, and were considered adequate by the World Heritage Committee.

The management of the site is primarily linked to the plans and planning processes developed by the local authorities, the Veneto Region, Treviso Province and the relevant municipalities. The coordination has been facilitated by the Consorzio di Tutela del Prosecco.
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ICOMOS considers that an overall management system for the nominated property is in place, and well-coordinated by the ATS, although a number of important aspects are not yet fully implemented.

Visitor management
Currently tourism numbers are modest, due to the relatively remote location of the nominated area. In 2014 the municipalities belonging to the nominated property represented only 7% of the visitors and 8% of the overnight stays of the Treviso Province. Aside from low-key recreational activities (such as walking and cycling), wine tourism contributes to the local economy. Car or coach tours occur mainly in the spring. The urban centres of Conegliano, Vittorio Veneto and Pieve di Soligo provide tourism accommodation infrastructure, which is otherwise sparsely distributed throughout the area. The State Party estimates that tourism numbers to the area between January and June are approximately 400,000.

ICOMOS considers that the area could benefit economically from a larger flow of tourists, but that the infrastructure for tourism transportation and accommodation is limited. Careful planning is needed to support growth, but without the risk of overcrowding, since many of the sites and access roadways are small.

ICOMOS is also considers that tourism planning requires an approach which encapsulates a wider area, and that the buffer zone should be treated as a positive contributor to the presentation of the property, rather than as an area designed to ‘absorb pressures’ (for example, apart from private dwellings, the nominated area has little potential for the creation of accommodation). However, as noted above, a number of settlements in the buffer zone suffer from buildings in poor condition, and visually intrusive infrastructure and industrial developments. Because these areas serve as a ‘gateway’ to the property for visitors, and could provide additional tourism accommodation capacity, these are issues that could affect the development of high-quality and sustainable tourism activities.

Community involvement
Public and private stakeholders were involved in the development of the nomination dossier. Wide contributions were included in the Temporary Association of Purpose (ATS) Colline di Conegliano Valdobbiadene which later became the ‘Association for the Heritage of the Prosecco Hills of Conegliano and Valdobbiadene’. The State Party has provided information on the participation and activities of various stakeholders, although this is generally not well detailed in the nomination documents.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of the protection and management of nominated property
ICOMOS considers that the framework for legal protection and the management system for the property are adequate, although a number of aspects need strengthening, full implementation and completion for the long-term protection and management of landscape of Outstanding Universal Value. Accordingly, a number of additional recommendations have been made. They include: the improved documentation of the attributes; assessment and improvement of the state of conservation of buildings and vernacular architecture within the property and buffer zone; enhancements to the monitoring arrangements; completion and implementation of national, regional and municipal legal protection arrangements; development of sustainable tourism planning; establishment of formal Heritage Impact Assessment processes relevant to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property; and the involvement of local communities in management decisions and new initiatives. In particular, the management plan requires further development, adoption and implementation.

In summary, although a number of important further actions are recommended, ICOMOS considers the protection and management of the revised nominated property to be satisfactory.
6 Conclusion

The State Party has worked swiftly to respond to the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee in Decision 42 COM 8B.31 (Manama, 2018), and has produced a clear and concise revision to its original proposal. There is a helpful guide to the revised proposal that allows the parts that have been changed to be readily understood.

The response of the State Party in relation to the three aspects of the Refer Back decision of the World Heritage Committee are considered specifically below:

Redefine the nomination refocusing the potential Outstanding Universal Value on criteria (iv) and (v). The revised nomination has reconsidered the justification for Outstanding Universal Value, and the State Party has decided to revise its proposal to focus on criterion (v) alone. The description of the property has been clearly presented in relation to these changes.

ICOMOS considers that criterion (v) is appropriate for the revised proposal, and that through further documentation and clarification of the attributes, the State Party has provided additional clarity about the comparative analysis, and the cultural and biological systems that underpin the cultural landscape. The justification for criterion (v) has been strengthened. ICOMOS considers that the landscape is vulnerable, in part due to the pressures of increasing production of Prosecco to service the world market, and that strong protection is warranted.

Redefine the boundaries and buffer zones of the nominated property.
The revised nomination has greatly reduced the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone. The State Party has aimed to avoid the need for a serial property in this revised delineation. The excluded areas from the property are the ‘corridors’ that run from northwest to southeast and contain some urbanised areas and infrastructure developments. The property boundary focuses on the main areas with the hogback landforms and vineyards, which is the area that demonstrates the greatest authenticity in relation to the justification of Outstanding Universal Value. It is more clearly delineated by natural topographic characteristics, and has a more consistent representation of attributes of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value. Much of the area that has been excluded from the original boundary of the nominated property is now included in the buffer zone. The buffer zone has been also reduced in size, excluding areas that are not coherent with the landscape characteristics of the revised nominated property. A further ‘Commitment Area’ beyond the buffer zone has also been delineated by the State Party.

The State Party considers that these changes address the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee’s decision and the ICOMOS Advisory process. Based on topographic rather than administrative considerations, ICOMOS considers that the revised boundary and buffer zone better demonstrate a landscape approach, and are more logical and coherent. The boundary is considered appropriate in relation to the revised justification for Outstanding Universal Value. The establishment of the ‘Commitment Area’ seems beneficial for ensuring the protection of the essential ecosystem processes that support the continuing viticulture and other land management processes.

Completing the adoption process by the 28 concerned municipalities of the tool “Technical rule – Articolo Unico”, which was already approved by the Veneto Region in January 2018.
The ‘Technical Rule – Sole Article’ is an urban regulation to introduce more specific rules for the nominated property and the buffer zone, and was initiated by the Veneto Region. This process has required the involvement of 28 municipalities, based on a Memorandum of Understanding signed in 2016. There are three main components: a shared urban planning regulation; links to the Management Plan and its objectives; and the intention to prepare a set of shared documents. This is considered by ICOMOS to provide a stronger coordination of governance and management across a wider area that includes the property, the buffer zone and the ‘Commitment Area’.

The World Heritage Committee decision also noted that the general state of conservation of the site is adequate, the adopted measures of conservation are generally effective, and that the governance, monitoring, funding and management systems are in place. ICOMOS has provided some additional recommendations to further strengthen the systems for legal protection and management of the cultural landscape.

7 Recommendations

Recommendations with respect to inscription
ICOMOS recommends that Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene, Italy, be inscribed on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape on the basis of criterion (v).

Recommended Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief synthesis
The Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene in northeast Italy is an area characterised by distinctive hogback morphological system which provides a distinctive mountain character with scenic vistas, and an organically evolved and continuing landscape comprised of vineyards, forests, small villages and agriculture. For centuries, the harsh terrain has both shaped and been adapted by distinctive land use practices. They include the land and soil conservation techniques that comprise the viticultural practices using Glera grapes to produce the highest quality Prosecco wine. Since the 17th century, the use of the ciglioni – the patterned use of grassy
terraces used to cultivate areas with steep slopes – has created a distinctive chequerboard pattern with rows parallel and vertical to the slopes. In the 19th century, the specific training of the vines known as bellussera, was developed by local farmers, contributing to the aesthetic characteristics of the landscape. The mosaic appearance of the landscape is a result of historical and ongoing environmental and land use practices. The plots dedicated to vineyards, established on ciglioni, coexist with forest patches, small woodlands, hedges, and rows of trees that serve as corridors connecting different habitats. In the hogbacks, small villages are scattered along the narrow valleys or perched on the crests.

Criterion (v): The Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene is a viticulture landscape resulting from the interaction of nature and people over several centuries. The adaptation and transformation of the challenging terrain of the hogback geomorphology has required the development of specific land use practices, including: vineyard management by hand on steep slopes; the grassy terraces known as ciglioni, which follow the contours of the land, stabilising the soils and vineyards; and the bellussera training system which was developed in the area about 1880. As a result, the vineyards contribute to a distinctive ‘chequerboard’ appearance with perpendicular rows of high vines, interspersed with rural settlements, forests and small woods. Despite many changes, the history of sharecropping in this area is also reflected in the landscape patterns.

Integrity

The boundary of the property is of adequate size, and contains the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value within a topographically distinct and intact landform. Despite many changes and challenges posed by pests, wars, poverty, and the industrialisation of viticulture, many of the attributes such as the vineyards, ciglioni and architectural elements demonstrate a good state of conservation, and the patches of forest have been maintained. Ecological processes are critically important for the sustainability of the landscape and the vineyards. Threats are currently managed, although the state of conservation of some elements (particularly architectural and urban elements in the buffer zone) require improvement, and climate change has accentuated the incidence of landslides. The landscape could be vulnerable to irreversible change due to the pressures of production of Prosecco within a growing global market. Agricultural and viticultural techniques for maintaining the integrity of the landscape are continuing, including manual harvesting.

Authenticity

The main attributes of the property relate to the distinctive landscape, where nature and human history have shaped and been shaped by an adapted and specific system for viticulture and land use. Despite many changes, the attributes demonstrate authenticity, and are documented through sources such as inventories and cadasters, historical and religious paintings, and historical documents that demonstrate the introduction of the ciglioni, and the operation of the sharecropping system from the first land registries in the 18th century.

Management and protection requirements

The property and its attributes are subject to protection measures at national and local levels; and municipalities and professional associations have introduced additional safeguards through territorial planning tools and the formation of legal and voluntary charters. The protection of the rural landscape is primarily guaranteed by the rules of the Conegliano Valdobbiadene Prosecco Superiore DOCG that favour the maintenance of the vineyards, ciglioni and other attributes that are fundamental for maintaining local traditions and to the protection of the agricultural biodiversity and associated ecosystem services.

Almost all of the property has been nominated to the National Register of Historical Rural Landscapes, a programme developed by the Ministry of Agriculture for the protection of agricultural rural landscapes. The forest vegetation is protected by the forest restrictions included in the National Code for Cultural Heritage, as well as by the management plan of the Site of Community Interest (SCI) of the EU Natura 2000 network applicable to the area. The buildings of historical and monumental value are all protected at national level by the Codice dei Beni Culturali e del Paesaggio (Cultural Heritage and Landscape Code) issued by Legislative Decree No. 42, 22 January 2004, along with all public buildings, state property and church-owned buildings that are more than 50 years old. The legal protection could be further strengthened through the implementation of the Detailed Landscape Plan (Piano Paesaggistico di Dettaglio) (PPD) at the regional level; the implementation of Intermunicipal regulation of rural police (Regolamento intercomunale di polizia rurali); and the full implementation of the ‘Technical rule - Sole Article’ in all relevant municipalities.

The management of the site is primarily linked to the plans and planning processes developed by the local authorities – the Veneto Region and the Treviso Province – which support and guarantee the participation of all stakeholders through a specific Regional Law (No. 45/2017). Construction of new production areas and buildings in the agricultural zone that are not strictly necessary for the working of agricultural land is not permitted. The Management Plan requires further development, adoption and implementation.

Additional recommendations

ICOMOS further recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:

a) Clarifying the extent of the Commitment Area (in hectares),

b) Providing detailed mapping and inventories of the attributes of the property (particularly the vernacular,
historic or modern architecture and settlements), with a clear distinction of the contents of the property and the buffer zone, and including inventories of flora and fauna,
c) Establishing as a priority, a detailed condition assessment of all the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value, and incorporating this into the management system and monitoring arrangements,
d) Expanding the description of the present-day socio-economic system in relation to its history as part of the management and planning for the long-term sustainability of the cultural landscape,
e) Identifying and planning for the improvement of visually detrimental infrastructure, settlements and industrial facilities in the buffer zone (particularly to the north of the property and in the plain),
f) Improving the state of conservation of buildings in the property and buffer zone – particularly the vernacular architecture - based on a thorough inventory and condition assessment,
g) Improving the documentation of the contributions to the landscape character by historical and current forest management,
h) Further developing the monitoring system by adding indicators for the assessment of the state of conservation and the biodiversity of the property,
i) Further strengthening the protection for the landscape through implementation of the Detailed Landscape Plan (Piano Paesaggistico di Dettaglio) (PPD) at the regional level, the implementation of Intermunicipal regulation of rural police (Regolamento intercomunale di polizia rural), and through the implementation of the recently finalised adoption of the ‘Technical Rule – Sole Article’ by all relevant municipalities,
j) Fully including the property in the National Register of Historical Rural Landscapes, and fully incorporate its rules into the management system,
k) Further developing and finalising the management plan,
l) Developing sustainable tourism planning based on an approach which incorporates the property, buffer zone and Commitment Area, giving attention to the quality and consistency of new tourism facilities and infrastructure,
m) Enhancing the involvement of local communities in the management structures, and ensuring that local benefits flow from tourism and sustainable development strategies,
n) Ensuring that all new developments – including tourism infrastructure and wind or solar power installations in the buffer zone – are subject to rigorous Heritage Impact Assessment processes that consider their potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and its setting prior to their approval,
o) Ensuring that all major projects that could impact on the property are communicated to the World Heritage Centre in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention;
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The 20th Century Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright
(United States of America)
No 1496rev

Official name as proposed by the State Party
The 20th-Century Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright

Location
Oak Park, Illinois
Chicago, Illinois
Spring Green, Wisconsin
Los Angeles, California
Mill Run, Pennsylvania
Madison, Wisconsin
Scottsdale, Arizona
New York, New York
United States of America

Brief description
The property “The 20th-Century Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright” focusses upon the influence that the work of the American architect, Frank Lloyd Wright (1867-1959), had, not only in his own country but, on the architecture of the 20th century and the recognized masters of the Modern Movement in architecture in Europe. The qualities of what is known as ‘organic architecture’ developed by Wright, including the open plan, the blurring between exterior and interior, the new uses of materials and technologies and the explicit responses to the suburban and natural settings of the various buildings, have been acknowledged as pivotal in the development of modern architectural design in the 20th century.

The property includes a series of 8 buildings designed and built over the first half of the 20th century; each component has specific characteristics, representing new solutions to the needs for housing, worship, work, education and leisure. The diversity of functions, scale and setting of the components of the series fully illustrate the architectural principles of ‘organic architecture’.

Category of property
In terms of categories of cultural property set out in Article I of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, this is a serial nomination of 8 monuments.

1 Basic data

Included in the Tentative List
30 January 2008, as “Frank Lloyd Wright Buildings”

Background
The nomination “Key Works of Modern Architecture by Frank Lloyd Wright” was examined by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th Session (Istanbul, 2016); the Committee adopted Decision 40 COM 8B.30, which reads as follows:

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Documents WHC/16/40.COM/8B and WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B1,

2. Refers the examination of the nomination of Key Works of Modern Architecture by Frank Lloyd Wright, United States of America, on the World Heritage List, in order to allow the State Party, with the advice of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre if requested to

a) redefine the rationale for a series of components (not necessarily the ones currently nominated) that might have the potential to justify Outstanding Universal Value through conveying the way one or more exceptional facets of the oeuvre of Frank Lloyd Wright influenced the architecture of the 20th century,

b) define more structured management for individual components coordinated by the Frank Lloyd Wright World Heritage Council,

c) examine and pursue opportunities to revise the nominated property boundaries, expand buffer zones and enhance protection in and beyond the buffer zones for component sites in relation to the attributes of potential Outstanding Universal Value;

3. Encourages the State Party to consider inviting ICOMOS to offer advice on the above recommendations in the framework of the Upstream Process.

At the request of the State Party, an ICOMOS Advisory Process was carried out in two phases: a first one from August 2016 to February 2017 and a second one which ended in April 2018. The outcomes of this process and ICOMOS recommendations have been taken into account by the State Party and incorporated in the revised version of the nomination dossier.

Consultations and Technical Evaluation Mission
Desk reviews have been provided by ICOMOS International Scientific Committees, members and independent experts.

During the assessment of the original nomination dossier, two ICOMOS technical evaluation missions visited different parts of the property: the first from 1 to 13 September 2015 and the second from 11 to 23 September 2015. After the World Heritage Committee decision in 2016, no further ICOMOS technical evaluation mission visited the nominated property.

Additional information received by ICOMOS
After the reception of the revised nomination dossier, no further information was requested to the State Party.

Date of ICOMOS approval of this report
13 March 2019
2 Description of the property

Note: The revised nomination dossier contains detailed descriptions of this property, its history and its state of conservation. Due to limitations on the length of evaluation reports, this report only provides a short summary of the most relevant aspects.

Description and History

The work of Frank Lloyd Wright exercised a remarkable influence not only in his own country, the United States of America, but also far beyond, including some of the masters of the European Modern Movement in architecture. The revised nomination dossier includes a series of 8 buildings projected over the first half of the 20th century, selected out of some 400 buildings still surviving. They are:

- Unity Temple, Oak Park, Illinois, designed 1905, constructed 1906-1909.
- Frederick C. Robie House, Chicago, Illinois, designed 1908, constructed 1910.
- Taliesin, Spring Green, Wisconsin, begun 1911, constructed 1911-1959.
- Hollyhock House, Los Angeles, California, designed 1918, constructed 1918-1921.
- Taliesin West, Scottsdale, Arizona, begun 1938.

Unity Temple, Oak Park, Illinois, designed 1905, constructed 1906-1909.

Unity Temple was constructed in the Chicago suburb of Oak Park, where Wright lived and worked between 1887 and 1909. It sits on a corner plot of the urban grid pattern, facing one of the main roads. Built entirely out of monolithic reinforced concrete, the building consists of two rectangular blocks, one for the church and the second for teaching and office spaces, linked by an entrance foyer. The main space was designed to accommodate four hundred worshippers in multiple levels of seating under a coffered ceiling lit by twenty-five art glass skylights. Wright designed the interior and exterior finishes, as well as lighting fixtures and furniture, all of which are still in place.

Frederick C. Robie House, Chicago, Illinois, designed 1908, constructed 1910.

This horizontal house with low pitched roof, massive central chimney, long rows of low windows and continuous roofed balconies that over sail the ground floor rooms, is the largest of a group of similarly formed houses in Oak Park, which are identified with the Prairie School of Architecture that Wright and others developed in the first decade of the 20th century. The term “Prairie” was seen to symbolise the expansive qualities of the Illinois and the Midwest prairie landscapes.

Taliesin, Spring Green, Wisconsin, begun 1911, constructed 1911-1959.

Taliesin was constructed by Wright as his home and studio in a hilly rural area of Wisconsin. It was begun in 1911 and became his summer studio after Taliesin West was built in 1938. Various buildings underwent re-building work after two major fires as well as expansion over a period of some fifty years. The estate also includes Hillside Home School, the drafting studio, galleries, theatre, and Midway Barn, Tan-y-deri, the residence for his sister and the related windmill. The buildings, with low pitched roofs, stone clad walls, and overhanging balconies cascade irregularly down the hill from a tower-like belvedere. They have views across a lake to more hills beyond or to an enclosed hill garden designed by Wright.

Hollyhock House, Los Angeles, California, designed 1918, constructed 1918-1921.

Hollyhock House was built around a pillared courtyard and is ornamented with hollyhock motifs in cast concrete and stained glass. The house was built as a nucleus for a cultural centre at the moment when Hollywood was taking off as a movie centre. The form of the house reflects Spanish patio house traditions and has references to ancient Mayan forms. The large courtyard was designed for theatrical performances and the surrounding roof terraces linked by stairways and bridges provided viewing platforms for drama and dance. Wright designed furniture for the open plan living and dining rooms, most of which remains in the house. Many of its architectural features seem to herald later works in Los Angeles such as the so-called ‘textile-block’.


Fallingwater is sited on top of a small waterfall in the southern Laurel Highlands. Built as a weekend retreat for Edgar and Liliane Kaufmann, the three storey house sits on reinforced concrete slabs, apparently cantilevered from a central chimney, and covered with random stone paving. The slabs provide the interior floors and extensive open terraces overlooking the small gorge. The vertical walls are of locally quarried stone. Extensive plate glass windows of the large main living room and smaller studies and bedrooms provide thin barriers between the inside and outside.

Herbert and Katherine Jacobs House, Madison, Wisconsin, designed 1936, constructed 1936-1937.

This small house was the first of Wright’s so-called Usonian houses, of which over 300 were built. They aimed to be modest single storey American suburban dwellings, with open plan living room and dining/kitchen. Often L-shaped and usually with a small garden, they were constructed from standardised building components. The houses were specifically designed for the American landscape, with a strong visual connection between indoor and outdoor spaces.
Taliesin West, Scottsdale, Arizona, begun 1938. Began in 1938 as Wright’s winter home and as a studio for the Taliesin apprentices, Taliesin West started as a simple camp in a desert setting. Over the last two decades of Wright’s life it developed extensive permanent buildings of angular forms with walls faced with rough local rubble stone and with translucent roofs. The extensive complex of interconnected spaces includes studios, conference rooms, dining room, apartments and guest rooms as well as Wright’s large beamed living room.

Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York, New York, designed 1943, constructed 1956-1959. The museum sits opposite Central Park and occupies one block of the New York City grid plan in an affluent neighbourhood. The building consists of three major components: the main spiral-shaped rotunda, the smaller, circular administrative office wing and the cantilevered bridge that connects the two. The dominant spiral of the rotunda coils around five times beneath a twelve sided domed skylight. The design of the entire complex is based on circles, triangles, and lozenges. The Guggenheim is constructed of concrete reinforced with steel rods. The original driveway was closed off later to create a museum store. In 1992 an addition was built that was more or less based on Wright’s original master plan. Further underground space was added in 1996.

History and development
The section is presented by the State Party in two parts: a study on the work of Frank Lloyd Wright in the historical context and, secondly, the specific history of each of the components. Due to length restrictions of this report, a summary is presented on general aspects of the history of the serial property.

The period covered by the components of this nomination is characterized by dramatic technological and social change both internationally and in the United States of America. The effects of industrialization had a significant impact on people and redefined the nature of both work as well as living and working environments. Pioneering architects of the early-modern era included the leading practitioners of the Art Nouveau movement in several European countries. The Arts and Crafts Movement became a major influence on the architects, designers, and craftpeople of the Vienna Secession and the Deutscher Werkbund. Architecture based on mechanization ideals was embraced by architects in some European countries in the decade preceding World War I.

The Chicago School was a significant American expression of modernism in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, marrying a practical embrace of up-to-date internal structural technologies with the clear aesthetic expression of structure on building exteriors.

In 1887 Frank Lloyd Wright arrived in Chicago during the building boom that followed the 1871 fire. Working first for Joseph Lyman Silsbee, Wright then left to join the more progressive firm of Adler and Sullivan, where he worked until 1893. Progressive American architects and their clients wanted an authentic American architecture, formally and functionally connected to the inherent beauty of natural “organic” principles. This new architecture was meant to embrace and exemplify American democracy and as such, Chicago and Prairie School architects, including Wright, influenced popular aspects of American architecture and visual culture.

Following a series of transitional experiments in the 1890s, Wright finally synthesized his thinking in what is known as the Prairie School or Prairie Style, which culminates with the Frederick C. Robie House, with its dynamic cantilever, horizontal form, open plan, and technical innovations. Within the historic context of American architecture of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Wright’s Prairie School designs are arguably the most radical expression of modernist ideals in the United States before World War I, expressing the dynamic American society of the time. Among Wright’s early public buildings, the Unity Temple in Oak Park stands out; in this building Wright abandoned the concrete frame in favour of monolithic reinforced concrete, in conjunction with the structural cantilever, to create a plasticity of space defined by intersecting and overlapping planes.

These early works drew the attention of European modernists who admired their shifting planes, abstract masses and open plans when they were presented in the German publication by Ernst Wasmuth of 1911.

Wright continued to embrace progressive modernist ideals of form, ornament and space during the 1920s, ever experimenting with new ways of designing. The Hollyhock House in Los Angeles embraced a monumentality of form while continuing to show his love of abstract ornament based on nature. This building marked a new direction in Wright’s work as he explored new landscape and cultural forms very different from that of the Midwest; he turned to regional sources such as Mayan architecture and the Spanish colonial patio house.

During the 1930s, Wright designed a number of buildings that revived his public image and set the stage for the last two decades of his career. In addition to Fallingwater, these included buildings for the S.C. Johnson Company and a more spatially modest home for Herbert and Katherine Jacobs. He also began an ongoing construction and expansion of Taliesin West, his winter home and studio in Arizona.

At Taliesin West, Wright abandoned the prevailing styles to once again demonstrate the primary importance of the landscape to the design of a modern building, providing an original response to a harsh desert site. The Usonian Houses, beginning with the Herbert and Katherine Jacobs House, introduced a design and construction method accessible to clients of moderate means, easily adapted to sites in different parts of the country and that could meet the functional needs of varied clients. Many of the features of the Usonian house would be incorporated into
suburban housing after World War II, influencing the design of post-war suburban houses throughout the United States.

After World War II, rationalist ideas about architecture gained popularity, especially for commercial and institutional buildings. In contrast, some architects turned away from such design theories and aesthetics in favour of more personal expressions of form and materials in their search for visually and spatially powerful architecture. Wright, in his search for greater spatial effects and dynamic forms, also focused on such personal expressions; in his case, focusing on extruding the spiral from the circle. It was in one of his most famous works, the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, in which he more fully realized the spiral’s capacity for energizing space.

It becomes clear that the Modern Movement was not limited to one overarching school of thought; many trends encompassing a variety of personal expressions were also present. One approach, organicism, or what Wright termed “organic architecture,” paralleled and contrasted with much of the rational modernism of Le Corbusier, Mies van der Rohe and Walter Gropius.

In summary, designs and buildings of Frank Lloyd Wright had an important influence over the development of architecture in the 20th century. His works were sourced by several previous ideas and by the specific socio-cultural American conditions and landscape.

**Boundaries**
The area of the 8 components totals 26.369 ha, with buffer zones totaling 710.103 ha.

For 5 of the 8 components, (Unity Temple, the Frederick C. Robie House, Hollyhock House, the Herbert and Katherine Jacobs House, and the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum), the boundaries of the nominated zones correspond to their respective National Historic Landmark boundaries. For Taliesin, Fallingwater, and Taliesin West, which are located in expansive natural settings, the boundaries are proposed to encompass the primary designed buildings and their immediate settings, while the much larger boundaries of the National Historic Landmarks contribute to the buffer zones, thus ensuring that the larger settings are protected.

ICOMOS notices that in the case of Taliesin, some architectural and landscape components of the estate are not included in the nominated area, although they are encompassed in the National Historic Landmark boundaries and in the proposed buffer zone. The State Party explains that “though designed by Wright, they fulfilled primarily functional roles in the estate and do not exhibit to any notable degree the ‘organic’ qualities (relation to the landscape, rooms extended diagonally out to terraces, meandering forms incorporating outdoor spaces, adaptation of Japanese forms) that comprise the outstanding values of the main Taliesin house”. ICOMOS considers that, though protected by the federal designation, the State Party could envisage a future minor modification of boundaries to include these items within the nominated area.

Each of the components of the serial nomination has its own buffer zone. They have been established according to the specific setting of the components. In the case of components located in urban or suburban areas, the buffer zones encompass the immediate surroundings of the buildings and include specific provisions to ensure a supplementary protection of the nominated items. In relation to the original nomination, the proposed buffer zones of the Herbert and Katherine Jacobs House and Hollyhock House have been enlarged. For those components where the architectural design considered views of the surrounding natural landscape (Taliesin, Fallingwater and Taliesin West), the State Party has ensured that critical views are protected within the buffer zones.

For Robie House, while acknowledging that local and university provisions are in place, ICOMOS considers that the State Party should consider to ensure control of potential development impact in Woodlawn Garden, diagonally opposite the series’ component.

ICOMOS considers that the boundaries of the nominated and buffer zones for each of the components are, in general, adequate, but the State Party could envisage the extension of the nominated area in Taliesin and the buffer zone in Robie House.

**State of conservation**
Based on the information provided by the State Party and the observations of the ICOMOS technical evaluation missions, ICOMOS considers that the overall state of conservation of the components of the series is very good. Details on active conservation measures are described in the Conservation section of this report.

Unity Temple is in very good state of conservation, following a comprehensive repair and restoration project undertaken between April 2015 and June 2017.

The Frederick C. Robie House has recently undergone an extensive restoration to return the building to good condition.

In Taliesin, all of the buildings and landscape features proposed for inscription are, overall, in a good state of conservation; a number of significant conservation projects have been undertaken since 2015. Hollyhock House is presently in a good state of conservation with all building components and systems in good condition.

Fallingwater is in a good state of conservation. In 2002, a major rehabilitation of the terraces was undertaken in order to arrest the deformation of the concrete terraces. In 2012, new cracks appeared along the tops of the reinforced concrete bolsters supporting the first floor and an old crack reopened on the master terrace. In 2013, electronic monitors were installed on the building but have not recorded serious further changes.
The Herbert and Katherine Jacobs House is in very good condition; the most recent work has been the replacement of the flat roof surface. Taliesin West is in a good state of conservation; a conservation and preservation programme to address building problems has been implemented.

The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum is in a good state of conservation. An extensive preservation and conservation campaign for the exterior was undertaken from 2005 to 2007.

Factors affecting the property
Based on the information provided by the State Party and the observations of the ICOMOS technical evaluation missions, ICOMOS considers that the main factors affecting the property are development pressures and natural disasters.

For most sites, there is no evidence of current adverse development pressures on the site or in the buffer zone and wider settings. The one main exception is Taliesin West; the nearby City of Scottsdale has expanded and is heading towards the site. Currently the site is separated from the suburban sprawl, but will impact it eventually as even the buffer zone is zoned for development. There is also potential for the impact of development at the Robie House, where the missing and height of potential new development in the immediate neighbourhood could overshadow the relationship of the building to its urban setting.

Earthquakes are a serious threat for Hollyhock House; they are almost certain to happen at sometime, but preventive measures have been taken. After the 1994 Northridge earthquake an extensive conservation and stabilization program was carried out at Hollyhock House and the most recent project (2009-2012) included additional seismic retrofitting.

Flooding is mainly a threat for Fallingwater but disaster preparedness plans are in place.

Fire is the main threat to sites that lack of fire suppression strategies and where related systems are designed for life-safety and not necessarily to save the buildings or the collections. The Guggenheim Museum is the only building with a reliable fire suppression system in place.

ICOMOS notes that while certain aspects of risk management have been well attended to in some component sites, overall there is a lack of risk management plans for all the sites. Though provisions are in place, risk management plans, which encompass not only the buildings but, where appropriate, their contents and setting, should be elaborated upon and implemented.

3 Proposed justification for inscription

Proposed justification
The nominated serial property is considered by the State Party to be of Outstanding Universal Value as a cultural property for the following reasons:

- The series illustrates a full range of ways in which Wright’s unique approach to architectural design fused form with spirit to influence the course of architecture in both North America and beyond.
- Each building has strong individual characteristics, presenting a specific aspect or facet of a new architectural solution to the needs of Americans for housing, worship, work, and leisure.
- The buildings employ geometric abstraction and spatial manipulation as a response to functional and emotional needs and are based literally or figuratively on nature’s forms and principles. In adapting inspirations from global cultures, they break free of traditional forms and facilitate modern life.
- The substantial range of function, scale, and setting in the series underscores both the consistency and the wide applicability of these principles, which are often called “organic architecture.”
- The series showcases innovations such as the open plan, the blurring of the boundary between interior and exterior, new uses of materials such as steel and concrete, as in cantilevered construction, new technologies such as radiant heating, the embrace of the automobile and explicit responses to natural settings. Such features are subordinated to designs that integrate form, materials, technology, furnishings, and setting into a unified whole.

Comparative analysis
The comparative analysis is presented in three parts: identification of comparable properties relating to the proposed attributes of Outstanding Universal Value, the comparison of properties and proposed Outstanding Universal Value and, finally, the identification of comparative Frank Lloyd Wright properties showing the selection process for the nominated series and those identified as possible future extensions to the series.

In the first part, the State Party has identified architectural movements during the same period of the nominated serial property, as well as bodies of works by architects represented on the World Heritage List, on tentative lists, and other architects relevant to the comparison. The architectural movements identified are Art Nouveau, Secession, Jugendstil and Modernism; the Arts and Crafts Movement in Great Britain and the United States; Expressionism and its antecedents; Dutch Modernism and De Stijl; Art Deco and the Modern Movement, including American Modernism.
Bodies of works and buildings related to those movements inscribed on the World Heritage List are extensive and include works by recognised masters of the Art Nouveau, Art Deco and Modern Movements (including Antoni Gaudi, Victor Horta, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Luis Barragan, Walter Gropius, and Le Corbusier).

In terms of tentative lists, the State Party has identified bodies of work and buildings of Henry van de Velde, Cubanacan (Cuba, relevant to the Arts and Crafts movement), Alvar Aalto, Alvaro Siza’s Architecture Works in Portugal Sanatorium Zonnestraal (Netherlands, relevant to the Modern Movement), Napier Art Deco Historic Precinct, and the timeless, humanistic architecture of Jože Plečnik. Other bodies of work not included on the World Heritage List or tentative lists are those of Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Walter Gropius and Alvar Aalto.

In the second part of the study, the State Party has compared the nominated serial property with other architectural movements and bodies of work, on the basis of the three attributes proposed to convey the Outstanding Universal Value of the series.

Attribute 1: Creation of an architecture responsive to functional and emotional needs through geometric abstraction and spatial manipulation
The State Party considers that while the comparable movements and architectural bodies of work exhibit elements of formal abstraction, spatial manipulation, blurring of interior and exterior space, and structural innovation, none employ it in a way that focused on functional and emotional needs to the same elevated degree as this series. The State Party highlights the influence of Wright on movements such as De Stijl, or architects such as Le Corbusier, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Walter Gropius or Alvar Aalto, who also created works with open plan. In the case of Le Corbusier, Mies van der Rohe and Gropius, some differences with the body of works by Wright lie on the more intellectual aim (Le Corbusier), less emotional effect (Mies) and rationalism and austerity (Gropius). Although Aalto moved from functionalism to a more organic language, the State Party considers that it rarely achieved Wright’s level of unified expression. In summary, the nominated series is distinguished by a highly consistent use of geometric abstraction for both functional and emotional effect.

Attribute 2: Design inspired by nature’s forms and principles
It is stated that, in general, the architecture of the 20th century progressively moved further away from connections to the natural world. Movements such as Art Nouveau or the body of works by Gaudi used nature as a source of inspiration. Wright’s works during this period, however, were notable for the consistent reference to nature’s forms and principles, but in abstracted form, and always integrated with his use of materials. Though architects of the Modern Movement employed a unity of design, this was generally expressed through rational simplicity rather than Wright’s elaboration of ornament integrated with the larger design; many modern architects looked rather to industrial sources for inspiration in materials and finishes, which further distanced their connection to nature. Overall, however, the tendency in 20th century architecture was to focus on functional values and a preoccupation with the machine aesthetic; this series stands apart in its fidelity to the goal of integrating concepts of space and structure into a single organism.

Attribute 3: Architecture responsive to an evolving American experience.
The State Party considers that while many architects in the 20th century were interested in solving issues related to housing, their efforts were more often directed to the collective user, not individualistic programs tailored to client wishes or needs. The architects of the Modern Movement pursued universal solutions that were intentionally not tied to specific places or cultures. According to the State Party, Wright created solutions that fit the needs, both functional and emotional, of modern life beyond the borders of the United States.

As a summary, and in relation to criterion (ii), proposed by the State Party, it is argued that a number of common themes run through the development of architecture in the first half of the 20th century. What distinguishes this serial property is the distinct and comprehensive solution offered to these issues, an architectural vision expressed in specific architectural forms that, though they evolved considerably in form and expression over a sixty-year span, were remarkably consistent. Although a number of other modern works of architecture exhibit to some degree one or more of the attributes that characterize the global interchange of ideas and influence of Wright’s architecture, none did so in a way that incorporated Wright’s organic principles in all three critical attributes, and none did so with the same effect and influence, and over such a sustained period of time.

In the third part of the comparative analysis, the selection process to define the components of the series and those identified for possible future extensions is explained. Out of some 430 existing buildings and structures by Frank Lloyd Wright, the State Party has focussed on 37 located in the United States of America, based on the American Institute of Architects list and those considered National Historic Landmarks, and 4 outside the country.

The group of 41 buildings was considered under criterion (ii); many of them may not necessarily contribute to that criterion as they were not critical to an interchange of ideas in a global context. The Frank Lloyd Wright World Heritage Committee verified the existence of such influence first by identifying the work of other architects that manifest it in two primary ways: imitative interchange and transformative interchange. These interchanges were identified by examining the body of scholarly and critical publications, the exhibitions of Wright’s work, the visual evidence of the buildings’ influence in the work of other noted architects or by way of written accounts of a building’s effect on them. Finally, the selection committee considered the properties’ integrity and authenticity,
which resulted in the disqualification of several works. On this basis, the 8 components of the nominated series were selected, with the possibility of a future extension of the series to include 5 other buildings located in the United States of America and 1 in Japan.

Buildings that may be considered for a future extension to the nomination are: Ward Willits House (Highland Park, Illinois, 1902), Tazaemon Yamamura House (Ashiya-shi, Japan, 1918), Alice Millard House / La Miniatura (Pasadena, California, 1923), S.C. Johnson Administration and Building and Research Tower (Racine, Wisconsin, 1935; 1944), Paul Hanna House / Honeycomb House (Stanford, California, 1936), Herbert and Katherine Jacobs House II (Madison, Wisconsin, 1946). The nomination dossier includes information on how these components could further contribute to the proposed outstanding universal value of the series and to the attributes that convey it. ICOMOS considers that, when the assessment of required conditions will be completed, these structures could enhance the integrity of the series.

ICOMOS considers that the methodology for the comparative analysis is adequate, so too the selected movements and bodies of works corresponding to the same period of the nominated series. ICOMOS considers that the State Party succeeds in demonstrating how the nominated series is exceptional in the framework of the proposed three attributes and criterion for inscription and the influence of Frank Lloyd Wright's works over the first decade of the century.

With regard to the approach for the selection of buildings to include in the nominated series, and in future potential extensions, ICOMOS considers that the State Party has undertaken a rigorous work of selection based on the proposed attributes and on the contribution that each of the components could provide to the proposed Outstanding Universal Value of the series.

ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis justifies consideration of this property for the World Heritage List.

Criteria under which inscription is proposed
The serial property is nominated on the basis of cultural criteria (ii).

Criterion (ii): exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning, or landscape design;

This criterion is justified by the State Party on the grounds that the nominated series demonstrates an important interchange in the discourse that changed architecture on a global scale during the first half of the 20th century. The eight components of the serial property illustrate different aspects of a new approach to architecture consciously developed for an American context taking advantage of new materials and technologies, but which was also inspired by principles of the natural world and nurtured by other cultures and eras, particularly Japanese design traditions. These innovative ideas and the resulting unified architectural works were noted in European architectural and critical circles early in the century and modern architects in different regions of the world acknowledged the influence of Wright of their own work. Although Frank Lloyd Wright sought to establish new forms appropriate to the history, character, habits and geography of the United States of America, his buildings were suited to modern life in many countries, and in their fusion of spirit and form they evoked emotional responses that were universal in their appeal. Together, the series shows a comprehensive approach to architectural problems rather than showcasing individual buildings.

ICOMOS considers that the nomination dossier provides abundant information on the aspects mentioned to justify criterion (ii), especially the influence of the architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright in his own and in other countries. The table on pages 196-197 of the nomination dossier clearly explains the contribution of each of the components of the serial property to criterion (ii) on the basis of the three attributes proposed by the State Party and justifies the composition of the series.

ICOMOS considers that the nominated serial property meets criterion (ii) and that the serial approach is justified.

Integrity and authenticity

Integty
As a serial nomination, integrity refers to whether the component parts of the nomination sufficiently cover the attributes needed to demonstrate the Outstanding Universal Value suggested by the State Party. For each individual site, integrity relates to the completeness and coherence of sites in relation to their ability to display their contribution to the nominated value.

With regard to the series, the State Party has explained the methodology and process of selection of components on the basis of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value, attributes and criterion for inscription. In the nomination dossier, there is a clear explanation on how each of the components contributes to illustrating different aspects of the Outstanding Universal Value and the 3 proposed attributes and, as an ensemble, the components are proven to have exerted an influence on architecture over the first half of the 20th Century. ICOMOS considers that the criteria for the selection of components of the serial property are adequate and that the components parts reflect clear cultural and architectural links. Each of the components contributes to the proposed Outstanding Universal Value of the serial property in a defined and discernible way.

As for each of the components of the serial property, their boundaries include all the necessary elements to express their significance. The extension of the boundaries in 3 components located in relation to wider natural settings is adequate for a more accurate representation of the
relationships between the buildings and their natural surroundings. The components of the serial property include the buildings and interior furniture and all are overall adequately protected, which prevents from adverse effects. For Taliesin, a minor modification of the boundaries of the nominated area, to encompass all the structures designed by Wright and the landscape, could enhance the integrity of the individual component.

Authenticity

Authenticity of the whole serial property relates to the ability of the sites as a group to convey the Outstanding Universal Value as nominated. The conditions of authenticity for individual sites are met when their cultural values, as recognized in the nomination criteria proposed, are truthfully and credibly expressed through a variety of attributes, including form and design, materials and substance, use and function, location and setting and aspects related to traditions and other forms of intangible heritage.

In the case of modern architecture, it becomes necessary to keep in mind that new materials and construction techniques, or new uses of traditional materials, were used sometimes on an experimental basis, with no precise knowledge on how those elements could react over time. This is why, in many cases, modern buildings have been the object of extensive restoration works, including replacement of original components parts, in order to respond adequately to functional requirements or adaptation to new uses.

As a whole, the proposed series conveys its values through the proposed attributes. On the basis of their intrinsic characteristics, each of the component parts contributes to those attributes.

As for components of the serial nomination, each of the sites has remained largely unchanged since their construction. In some sites, the level of remaining original materials is high, but in a number, however, changes have been made and while the original forms remain sufficiently intact, and the modifications can be seen to be reasonable, and proportionate in relation to supporting the continued use of the building.

Most of the nominated sites are still used for their original purposes, contributing positively to their authenticity. The relationship between the sites and their settings is in general acceptable; the residential low density areas where some of the buildings are located (Unity Church, Robie House, Hollyhock House, Herbert and Katherine Jacobs House) have not experimented drastic changes in scale over time. In the case of buildings located in a natural setting (Taliesin, Fallingwater, Taliesin West) only Taliesin West poses some challenges because of the expansion of the city of Scottsdale.

In some cases structural problems have had to be resolved that have led to changes in structures and materials. Almost since its construction, water penetration was a problem at Unity Temple, with Wright himself undertaking initial repairs; many subsequent interventions, including the last extensive restoration, mean that the authenticity of materials and substance is not intact, but overall the form of the building remains largely true to the intentions of the architect. The Jacobs House has experienced significant changes to its building fabric since construction. Major portions of the concrete slab foundation have been replaced and large sections of the roof structure have been strengthened. The house has been extended at both ends; nevertheless overall the spirit of the original intention prevails and the repairs can be read as proportionate.

At the Robie House, there have been significant changes to its building fabric since construction; however, its form and footprint have been retained and its materiality sympathetically handled.

One site where conservation issues could impact on authenticity is at Taliesin. The authenticity of the materials and substance of the house have been well sustained, but the wider estate, which is inextricably linked to the house faces a range of conservation challenges which potentially impact the values of the house. The whole estate needs to be seen as an entity needs and managed and conserved as a cultural landscape.

In Taliesin West, the harsh desert environment has led to repeated replacement of certain building elements, such as the canvas roof and the wooden beams of the drafting room and its adjacent pergola which have been replaced with contemporary materials for durability and sustainability. However, the original desert masonry continues to be visually paramount within the complex.

The desert landscape to which Taliesin West responded is now under development pressures. During Wright’s time, its landscape setting had begun to change, with high tension wires built in close proximity to an important view, causing Wright to direct a major re-orientation of the growth of the campus complex. Today urban development is increasingly close, and the property has been zoned for suburban scale subdivision. The long views of the powerful desert landscape, still convey a strong sense of place, but changes in the nearer landscapes are beginning to impact negatively.

ICOMOS considers that the authenticity of the series has been demonstrated and that component sites present an acceptable degree of authenticity; the changes and replacements of material component parts must be understood as a means to keep their forms and uses.

ICOMOS considers that, despite some issues related to the authenticity of materials and substance, the requirements of integrity and authenticity have been met for the whole series.
Evaluation of the proposed justification for inscription

ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis, as proposed by the State Party, has demonstrated the exceptionality of the serial nomination in a global context and the justification for criterion (ii) is adequate. Seeking responses for a specific socio cultural context, Wright's buildings inspired many other architects and influenced the development of modern architecture at international level.

The serial property itself and its individual components exhibit an acceptable degree of integrity; although some components underwent restoration interventions, a situation quite common when dealing with modern architecture, all of them have retained their form and design and most of them their original uses and settings, which allows noting an acceptable degree of authenticity.

Attributes

The revised nomination is based on 3 main attributes; for each of them, the State Party has proposed 3 sub-attributes.

Attribute 1: Creation of an architecture responsive to functional and emotional needs through geometric abstraction and spatial manipulation
1A. Spatial continuity expressed through the open plan and blurred transitions between interior and exterior spaces
1B. Dynamic forms that employ innovative structural methods and an inventive use of new materials and technologies
1C. Richness of experience created through contrast and carefully composed paths of movement

Attribute 2: Design inspired by nature's forms and principles
2A. Integral relationship with nature.
2B. Unity of design expressed through integration of the parts to the whole.
2C. Intrinsic qualities of materials expressed.

Attribute 3: Architecture responsive to an evolving American experience
3A. Changing modes of living are addressed
3B. Primacy of the individual and individualized expression
3C. Transforming inspirations from other places and cultures

ICOMOS considers that the attributes are adequate to demonstrate the Outstanding Universal Value of the serial property and that each of the components contribute to convey it in an appropriate manner.

4 Conservation measures and monitoring

Conservation measures

The nomination dossier includes detailed information on active conservation measures for each of the components of the serial nomination.

At Unity Temple, the recent restoration (2015-2017) addressed all aspects of building restoration and upgrades needed to safeguard the immediate and long-term viability and sustainability of the building's exterior and interior, decorative, and environmental components. In the Robie House, the work on the property was carried out in several phases beginning with exterior work in 2002; between 2007 and 2009, a second phase of primarily interior preservation work was undertaken and, from 2015-2017, the Trust commenced work on the interior restoration.

In Taliesin, recent works include the repair of several parts of the building; current projects underway include roofing and drainage projects in the Hillside complex in the buffer zone. As for Jacobs House, the cyclic maintenance project was carried out as recommended in the Jacobs House Restoration and Preservation Plan.

Some of the problems in Taliesin West were caused by the experimental nature of much of the original construction; work in recent years has focused on repair and replacement of the site's utility infrastructure. Comprehensive upgrades to the gas line, water system and electrical system are in process.

Monitoring

For each of the components of the serial property, the State Party has identified key indicators to monitor the state of conservation of the buildings, according to their specific characteristics; the periodicity of the inspections and the location of records are summarised in the nomination dossier. Responsible persons for monitoring have also been reported.

ICOMOS notices that indicators are mostly related to buildings’ component materials and, in the cases of Fallingwater and Taliesin West, to landscape features. The indicators, though, are not directly related to the attributes proposed by the State Party to convey the Outstanding Universal Value of the serial property.

ICOMOS considers that the current monitoring indicators are adequate but do not clearly relate to the attributes that convey the Outstanding Universal Value and need to be augmented.

5 Protection and management

Documentation

The State Party reports that all the components of the series perform a routine inventory and perform an ongoing inspection of structures and buildings, with the
exception of the Herbert and Katherine Jacobs House where an inventory of personal property is performed less frequently. Financial records and administrative documents such as annual reports, meeting minutes, and correspondence are produced and stored, with their copies, by each site individually. Recordkeeping style varies by site, where they may be stored digitally on a museum-grade database, assembled as part of a professional appraisal, or as a series of photographs. Federal legal documents; management plans and structural documentation; and conservation procedures) also retained by the Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy. The Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy also maintains records of the Frank Lloyd Wright World Heritage Council (FLWWH Council) meetings and minutes as well as correspondence between it and the individual sites, the National Park Service and ICOMOS.

**Legal protection**

All of the components of the serial property are listed on the National Register of Historic Places and recognized as National Historic Landmarks (NHL), which is the highest possible national protection. Since this designation only affects actions resulting from decision-making on a Federal level, the strongest legal protection instruments for privately owned historic properties reside at the local government level or through private conservation easements. Some of the components are also protected on the basis of the regulation of the states where they are located.

The protective measures for each component of the series have been set out in the nomination dossier in detail. These comprehensive (but disparate measures) include conservation procedures, the designation of Historic Districts and Historic Landmark status, municipal zoning ordinances, covenant agreements, historic/cultural monument protection ordinances, charters, as well as deed restrictions and trust agreements.

**Management system**

The management coordination body is the Frank Lloyd Wright World Heritage Council, established in 2012 via a Memorandum of Agreement among the Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy and the owners and/or representatives of the owners of the individual component properties. Its purpose is to provide coordinated management of the property, based in cooperation and guided by a common understanding of values, principles, and objectives. The Council performs its functions by, among its main actions, holding regular meetings; advising on annual reports from each component site that provide information on conservation and management; serving as a collaborative resource for the preservation and management of the component sites; promoting the property; promoting research and recommending on proposals for future extensions of the property.

The Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy coordinates the work of the Council; it is an NGO with offices in Chicago, organized for the purpose of preserving and protecting the remaining works of Frank Lloyd Wright. The Council serves as an advisory body, and its recommendations do not supersede individual site management plans or local, state, or national preservation laws, ordinances, or regulations.

**Unity Temple, Oak Park**

The Unity Temple Unitarian Universalist Congregation continues to use the building and is responsible for regular maintenance. The Unity Temple Restoration Foundation is responsible for the comprehensive rehabilitation of the building. A new position of Building Engineer has been announced (2018), who will be responsible for developing and overseeing a maintenance program that will monitor the state of conservation; once the Building Engineer is hired, a maintenance plan will be created. A Master Conservation Plan exists (2006).

**Frederick C. Robie House, Chicago**

The Frank Lloyd Wright Trust manages the Robie House. Guiding documents include the Master Plan for the Restoration and Adaptive Use (1999), the Robie House Preservation Plan (2002), the Robie House Maintenance Manual (2015) and the Core Staff Training Manual. The Preservation Plan is updated annually by the Trust’s Preservation Architect; this review informs the next year’s budget planning process. The Trust is currently in the process of developing the Robie House Comprehensive Conservation Management Plan, whose completion is foreseen for April/May, 2019. The process will include input from the Preservation Committee and the public; the plan will incorporate all existing standards and plans that have been previously developed into one comprehensive plan for the building and site and will include a section on Visitor Management and Daily Visitor Operations and risk assessment.

**Taliesin, Spring Green**

The Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation is the owner and primary management responsible for the site. It has contracted Taliesin Preservation, Inc. (TPI), a local charitable organization, which operates public programming and secures support for preservation efforts through public and private funding channels. Guiding documents include Taliesin Preservation Policy (revised May 2013), Taliesin TPI Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation 2014 Memorandum of Understanding, Taliesin Stabilization and Restoration Master Plan (2008), Strategic Landscape Plan (1998) and Taliesin Historic Landscape Report (1999). A comprehensive management document, prepared by Foundation staff in 2018-19, will address for both Taliesin and Taliesin West all aspects of management policies, including interpretation, staff training, volunteer management, risk management, and maintenance, as well as conservation. A cyclical maintenance plan will be completed within the next year.
**Hollyhock House, Los Angeles**
The building is owned by the City of Los Angeles; the Department of Cultural Affairs (DCA) is responsible for the administration and conservation and prepares the annual budget. The Department of Recreation and Parks manages the Barnsdall Park landscape beyond the immediate setting of Hollyhock House; the Department of General Services is responsible for general building maintenance under the direction of DCA and the curator. The decision making process for conservation at Hollyhock House and its immediate setting is authorized and guided primarily by the Operating Agreement for Barnsdall Park Cultural Facilities, which establishes the conservation goals and standards for the long term preservation of the property and gives the Curator authority to identify and undertake conservation work. The Historic Structures Report provides more detailed guidance for specific conservation actions and is updated as needed. A general management plan that might clarify the management structure has not yet been drawn up.

**Fallingwater, Mill Run**
The site is managed by the owners, the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy (WPC), a private, non-profit organisation. A Fallingwater Advisory Committee, founded by the son of the original owner oversees the quality conservation management decisions. Preservation Maintenance Plan (2010) addresses routine and cyclical maintenance activities including housekeeping, informs the development by the Fallingwater senior staff of three-year strategic plans, which is approved by the Director and WPC Board. The 2018-2020 WPC Strategic Plan includes goals, objectives and actions for preservation, collections, education, visitor services, public relations, administration and capital improvements.

**Herbert and Katherine Jacobs House, Madison**
The house owner is responsible for all conservation planning and maintenance work. An offsite house manager monitors the house when the owner is absent and arranges tours with prior approval by the owner. The owner contracts with preservation specialists as needed for advice and to execute projects. Jacobs House Management Plan (October 2015) provides a preservation philosophy, outlines key areas of concern that will be monitored and a routine maintenance schedule. The owner maintains a complete record of major conservation activities during his ownership. The City of Madison also maintains a record of building permits issued for the property.

**Taliesin West, Scottsdale**
The Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation Taliesin West uses the site for its educational activities. Taliesin West Preservation Plan, Phase 1, was completed in May 2015 and includes a chronology of the buildings, a statement of preservation philosophy, assessment, recommendations, and priorities for conservation. Phase 2, which will be prepared in 2018-19, will address for both Taliesin and Taliesin West all aspects of management policies, including interpretation, staff training, volunteer management, risk management, and maintenance, as well as conservation. A Preservation Oversight Committee reviews and advises on conservation projects. Following the development of the strategic plan each year, an operating plan for the year is established on a departmental basis, laddering up to the overall goals and objectives of the strategic plan. This plan is approved by the President and CEO of the Foundation. Progress toward goals is measured routinely and reported quarterly to the Foundation’s Board of Trustees.

**Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York**
A general management plan as such has not been provided, the only plan is a Capital Project Plan (2013-2018). The overall day to day management structure appears effective.

**Visitor management**
All the buildings are open to the public; in the case of the Herbert and Katherine Jacob House tours are arranged on request and are scheduled in advance. Since components of the serial property vary greatly in their situations, the Frank Lloyd Wright World Heritage Council does not plan to develop a visitor management strategy that would fit all eight buildings in all instances. However, the Council has identified principles of visitation that include the following: monitoring indicators that will help establish baselines for limits of acceptable change to each property; provision of accommodations for disabled persons in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act; respect for the building’s original function; guaranty of a high quality visitor experience; ensuring funds are in place to support the sites’ operational and preservation needs through the development of an appropriate business plan and compelling vision to engage stakeholders.

Besides this general introduction, the State Party reports in detail on visitation provisions for each of the components of the serial property, including tours and programmes, access and parking, visitors information, amenities and safety and area amenities.

ICOMOS understands that it becomes difficult to establish a common visitors’ strategy for such a diverse group of buildings. Although the general principles established by the Frank Lloyd Wright World Heritage Council can be considered adequate, what is not clear is whether those principles are already in place or are planned for the future.

**Community involvement**
The nomination dossier does not include specific information on community involvement in the elaboration of the nomination. Taking into account the nature of the components of the series, there are no traditional communities directly associated to the sites.
Evaluation of the effectiveness of the protection and management of nominated property

ICOMOS notices that the protective instruments are adequate for each of the components of the serial property. Together with the individual management systems, these aspects appear to be adequate since the buildings exhibit a very good state of conservation. ICOMOS notices that there is a wide array of conservation and management instruments in place but only in a few components of these have been included in a management plan.

The Frank Lloyd Wright World Heritage Council constitutes the basis for a coordinated management of the serial property. Although its aims and functions are clearly established, as it is stated that the Council serves as an advisory body and its recommendations do not supersede individual site management plans or legal instruments at all the three levels of government, it is not totally clear what its capacity to guide the accurate management of the property and of its individual components is.

ICOMOS considers that updated information on the progress of the visitors' management strategy is required.

ICOMOS considers that the coordinated management of the serial property through the Council can be considered acceptable, but its functions should be reinforced in its capacity of advisory body. For individual components, the elaboration of management plans, summarising existing conservation and management instruments and including risk management, could contribute to a more appropriate approach to management.

6 Conclusion

Although conceived as responses to the requirements of a specific geographic and socio-cultural context, that of his own country, Frank Lloyd Wright architectural works had a significant influence that goes far beyond the boundaries of the United States of America. It is possible to identify different periods exhibiting, in the framework of some constant principles, summarised in the attributes proposed by the State Party, a permanent attitude of research for architectural innovation. Frank Lloyd Wright works of the first decade of the 20th century strongly impacted on the development of modern architecture in Europe; later production was always welcomed and it is possible to state that together with Le Corbusier and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Frank Lloyd Wright can be considered as one of the most influential architect of his century.

By Decision 40 COM 8B.30, the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to revise the original nomination dossier on the bases of the following recommendations:

a) redefine the rationale for a series of components that might have the potential to justify Outstanding Universal Value through conveying the way one or more exceptional facets of the oeuvre of Frank Lloyd Wright influenced the architecture of the 20th century.

The revised nomination has been reduced to 8 buildings. The State Party has deeply revised the arguments that supports the nomination, the attributes that convey the Outstanding Universal Value and the justification for inscription on the World Heritage List. This revised nomination is based on the interchange of human values over a specific span of time on developments in architecture. The State Party has opted for concentrate on the influence Wright’s work had globally and on how his work is related to different architectural movements of the late 19th and 20th centuries. Through comprehensive scholar research, verified in the revised comparative analysis, the refinement of the definition of the attributes and the justification for the proposed criterion for inscription, the revised nomination succeeds in demonstrating such an influence and how each of the components of the serial property contribute to its Outstanding Universal Value.

The criteria for selection of components have been clearly and convincingly explained and the summary tables included in the nomination dossier help to explain why these buildings have been selected and how they contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of the series.

b) define more structured management for individual components coordinated by the Frank Lloyd Wright World Heritage Council.

The State Party has provided additional information related to the management system of each of the individual components of the serial property and, especially, to the coordinating body, the Frank Lloyd Wright World Heritage Committee. Although some of the components do not have a management plan, the legal protection, for both nominated and buffer zones, the management instruments, the conservation plans and the provisions for risk and visitors management permit the verification of an adequate management system that becomes evident in the very good state of conservation of the individual components. Some additional recommendations on these issues can, however, be expressed.

What remains unclear is the role of the Frank Lloyd Wright World Heritage Committee in the decision-making process for the components of the serial.

c) examine and pursue opportunities to revise the nominated property boundaries, expand buffer zones and enhance protection in and beyond the buffer zones for component sites in relation to the attributes of potential Outstanding Universal Value;
As explained in the nomination dossier, the boundaries of nominated zones for three of the individual components (Taliesin, Fallingwater and Taliesin West) have been expanded in order to encompass their immediate settings, both natural and designed landscapes that are intimately related to the buildings. The extension of the nominated zone in Taliesin could contribute to a better understanding of values of the site through the inclusion of all of the structures designed by Wright as well as the landscape in which they are set.

The buffer zones for two individual components (Hollyhock House and Herbert and Katherine Jacobs House) have been expanded and for those components where the architectural design considered views of the surrounding natural landscape (Taliesin, Fallingwater and Taliesin West), the State Party has ensured that critical views are protected within the buffer zones. In the cases where the buffer zones have not been revised, a set of state and/or local legal provisions ensure the additional protection to the nominated areas. The State Party should consider the possibility of extension of the buffer zone for the Frederick C. Robie House.

In summary, ICOMOS considers that the State Party has responded satisfactorily to the requests by the World Heritage Committee.

7 Recommendations

Recommendations with respect to inscription

ICOMOS recommends that the 20th Century Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright, United States of America, be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (ii).

Recommended Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief synthesis

The 20th Century Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright focusses upon the influence that the work of architect, had, not only in his country, the United States of America, but more importantly, on architecture of the 20th century and upon the recognized masters of the Modern Movement in architecture in Europe. The qualities of what is known as ‘Organic Architecture’ developed by Wright, including the open plan, the blurring between interior and exterior, the new uses of materials and technologies and the explicit responses to the suburban and natural settings of the various buildings, have been acknowledged as pivotal in the development of modern architectural design in the 20th century.

The property includes a series of eight buildings designed and built over the first half of the 20th century; each component has specific characteristics, representing new solutions to the needs for housing, worship, work, education and leisure. The diversity of functions, scale and setting of the components of the series fully illustrate the architectural principles of “organic architecture”.

The buildings employ geometric abstraction and spatial manipulation as a response to functional and emotional needs and are based literally or figuratively on nature’s forms and principles. In adapting inspirations from global cultures, they break free of traditional forms and facilitate modern life. Wright’s solutions would go on to influence architecture and design throughout the world, and continue to do so to this day.

The components of the series include houses both grand and modest (including the consummate example of a “Prairie” house and the prototype “Usonian” house); a place of worship; a museum; and complexes of the architect’s own homes with studio and education facilities. These buildings are located variously in city, suburban, forest, and desert environments. The substantial range of function, scale, and setting in the series underscores both the consistency and the wide applicability of those principles. Each has been specifically recognized for its individual influence, which also contributes uniquely to the elaboration of this original architectural language.

Such features, related to innovation are subordinated to designs that integrate form, materials, technology, furnishings, and setting into a unified whole. Each building is uniquely fitted to the needs of its owner and its function and, though designed by the same architect, each has a very different character and appearance, reflecting a deep respect and appreciation for the individual and the particular. Together, these buildings illustrate the full range of this architectural language, which is a singular contribution to global architecture in spatial, formal, material, and technological terms.

The Outstanding Universal Value of the serial property is conveyed through attributes such as spatial continuity expressed through the open plan and blurred transitions between interior and exterior spaces; dynamic forms that employ innovative structural methods and an inventive use of new materials and technologies; design inspired by nature’s forms and principles; integral relationship with nature; primacy of the individual and individualized expression and transforming inspirations from other places and cultures.

Criterion (ii): The 20th Century Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright demonstrates an important interchange in the discourse that changed architecture on a global scale during the first half of the 20th century. The eight components illustrate different aspects of Wright’s new approach to architecture consciously developed for an American context; the resulting buildings, however, were in fact suited to modern life in many countries, and in their fusion of spirit and form they evoked emotional responses that were universal in their appeal. Reacting against prevailing styles in the United States, this approach took advantage of new materials and technologies, but was also inspired by principles of the natural world and was nurtured by other cultures and eras. These innovative
ideas and the resulting unified architectural works were noted in European architectural and critical circles early in the century and influenced several of the trends and architects of the European Modern Movement in architecture. Wright’s influence is also noticeable in the work of some architects in Latin America, Australia and Japan.

Integrity

The serial property contains all the elements necessary to express its Outstanding Universal Value since it encompasses the works generally understood by critics and other architects to have been most influential. Each component highlights a different aspect of the attributes that demonstrate this influence and contributes to illustrating different aspects of the Outstanding Universal Value in a defined and discernible way, and to reflect clear cultural and architectural links. As an ensemble, they prove to have exerted an influence on architecture over the first half of the 20th Century.

The boundaries of each of the components include all the key elements to express their significance, although a minor boundaries modification in Taliesin, to include all the structures and gardens designed by Wright, would allow a better understanding of the whole property. The boundaries in components located in relation to wider natural settings allow an accurate representation of the relationships between the buildings and their surroundings. The components of the serial property include the buildings and interior furniture and all are overall adequately protected; none suffers from adverse effects of development or neglect. Each building has benefited from careful and comprehensive conservation studies and expert technical advice to ensure a high level of preservation.

Authenticity

Most of the components of the serial property have remained remarkably unchanged since their construction in their form and design, use and function, materials and substance, spirit and feeling. Conservation of each of the buildings, when needed to correct long-term structural issues or repair deterioration, has been in accordance with high standards of professional practice, ensuring the long-term conservation of original fabric wherever possible, and the significant features of each site; in all cases work has been based on exceptionally complete documentation. Very few features have been modified; the changes and replacements of material component parts must be understood as a means of retaining their forms and uses. In cases where the original function has changed, the current use is fully consistent with the original design.

The relationship between the sites and their settings is in general acceptable; the residential low density areas where some of the buildings are located has not experienced drastic changes in scale over time, although this is an aspect that must be considered in the protection and management systems. In the case of buildings located in natural settings, only Taliesin West poses some problems because of the expansion of the city of Scottsdale.

Management and protection requirements

Each property has been designated by the United States Department of the Interior as an individual National Historic Landmark, which gives it, under federal law, the highest level of protection. One of the components of the series is owned by a local government; the others are privately owned by non-profit organizations, foundations and an individual. Each building is protected from alterations, demolitions, and other inappropriate changes through deed restrictions, local preservation ordinances and zoning laws, private conservation easements, and state law. Active conservation measures have been carried out for all of the components.

Each site has an effective management system that makes use of a suite of planning and conservation guidance. The management coordination body is the Frank Lloyd Wright World Heritage Council, established in 2012 via a Memorandum of Agreement between the Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy and the owners and/or representatives of the owners of the individual component properties. The Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy, an NGO with offices in Chicago organized for the purpose of preserving and protecting the remaining works of Frank Lloyd Wright, coordinates the work of the Council. Since the Council has an advisory capacity, its role in the decision making process should be strengthened.

The development and implementation of management plans for those components which do not already have them is recommended; risk preparedness and visitor management must be considered for all of the components of the serial property.

Key indicators to monitor the state of conservation of the buildings according to their specific characteristics have been identified; they are mostly related to buildings materials and, in the cases of Fallingwater and Taliesin West, to landscape features. The indicators, though, are not directly related to the attributes proposed by the State Party to convey the Outstanding Universal Value of the serial property.

Additional recommendations

ICOMOS further recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:

a) Considering the possibility of minor boundary modifications of the area in Taliesin in order to encompass all the structures designed by Frank Lloyd Wright,

b) Strengthening the protection of the setting of the Robie House, in particular to control potential development impact in Woodlawn Garden, by
considering the possibility of a minor boundary modification of the buffer zone,

c) Strengthening the capacity of the Frank Lloyd Wright World Heritage Council in order to ensure the appropriate coordinated management of the serial property,

d) Elaborating upon and implementing management plans for those individual components where they do not exist, in order to encapsulate the existing conservation and management instruments in place, including risk and visitors management;

ICOMOS encourages the State Party to proceed to the extension of the series in the future, when the conditions for the additional components are established.
Revised map showing the location of the nominated components
Fallingwater House
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Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz
(Germany)
No 534bis

1 Basic data

State Party
Germany

Name of property
Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz

Location
State of Saxony-Anhalt (Sachsen-Anhalt)

Inscription
2000

Brief description
The Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz is an exceptional example of landscape design and planning of the Age of the Enlightenment, the 18th century. Its diverse components – outstanding buildings, landscaped parks and gardens in the English style, and subtly modified expanses of agricultural land – serve aesthetic, educational and economic purposes in an exemplary manner.

Date of ICOMOS approval of this report
13 March 2019

2 Issues raised

Background
The Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz was inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv) in 2000. At the time of inscription, one component of the serial property did not have a buffer zone.

At the time of the ICOMOS evaluation mission to the property in 2000, modifications to the boundary were proposed and accepted by the State Party, resulting in the current boundary.

As part of Periodic Reporting in 2013 it was noted that the buffer zones could be improved.

Modification
This proposal involves minor changes to the property boundary to better align with the historic layout of the property, a correction to the size of the area of the property based on the latest available geographic information system, and the identification of a buffer zone for one component of the serial property. The State Party proposes to reduce the area of the property by 514 ha to 11,891 ha, and to increase the buffer zone by 2,784 ha.

The primary reasons for the modifications are to better align the boundary with the historic layout of the property, and to provide a buffer zone for one component – Palace Mosigkau.

The State Party has used precise cadastral maps in the framework of a geographic information system to identify the appropriate property boundary reflecting the historic layout of the Garden Kingdom based on available written sources and observations in monument protection arising from conservation and restoration work undertaken since inscription. These mapping efforts were undertaken for all 16 historic villages within the property, as well as for waterways, fields and meadows. This has resulted in 14 proposed changes to the property boundary involving 5 additions and 9 subtractions.

Of particular note is that at present, two long sections of the Elbe river are included in the property and form its northern boundary. These sections are proposed to be excluded on the basis that the significant cultivated landscape extended to the southern edge of the river.

The State Party characterises these modifications as correcting cartographic errors resulting from changes to the boundary that were made during the evaluation mission in 2000.

With regard to Palace Mosigkau, while a buffer zone was included for the major component of the property at the time of inscription, no buffer zone was provided for the Palace component as a result of an apparent oversight. The proposed buffer zone will encompass the historic settlement of Mosigkau as well as the meadows surrounding it. The proposed buffer zone surrounds the component on all sides, and was defined in order to provide effective protection against impacts such as those arising from the erection of tall structures.

The State Party offers a correction to the size of the area of the property. This is based partly on the difference between the size of the area provided in the nomination dossier which did not take account of the revised boundaries following the ICOMOS evaluation mission. The correction is also based on a re-calculation undertaken using the latest available geographic information system.

The boundary change will not affect management of the property. In the case of the proposed buffer zone, existing management arrangements will continue and no new arrangements are proposed.

The boundary change will have no impact regarding the legal protection the property. The small areas to be included in the property already share the highest level of legal protection under a federal law.
The proposed buffer zone also shares this level of legal protection with the property. It is listed as a monument area under the Conservation Law of the State of Saxony-Anhalt.

In the case of the exclusion of sections of the Elbe river, ICOMOS notes that it is not an identified attribute and its exclusion appears justified. In any event, the river will be within the buffer zone.

ICOMOS considers that the proposed modifications to the property boundary and the identification of a buffer zone for one component of the Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz will contribute to the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and strengthen its management.

3 ICOMOS Recommendations

Recommendation with respect to inscription
ICOMOS recommends that the proposed minor modification to the boundary of the Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz, Germany, be approved.

ICOMOS recommends that the proposed buffer zone for one component of the Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz, Germany, be approved.
Map showing the revised boundaries of the property and of the buffer zone.
Maulbronn Monastery Complex  
(Germany)  
No 546bis

1 Basic data

State Party  
Germany

Name of property  
Maulbronn Monastery Complex

Location  
District of Enz, State of Baden-Württemberg

Inscription  
1993

Brief description  
Founded in 1147, the Cistercian Maulbronn Monastery is considered the most complete and best-preserved medieval monastic complex north of the Alps. Surrounded by fortified walls, the main buildings were constructed between the 12th and 16th centuries. The monastery’s church, mainly in Transitional Gothic style, had a major influence in the spread of Gothic architecture over much of northern and central Europe. The water-management system at Maulbronn, with its elaborate network of drains, irrigation canals and reservoirs, is of exceptional interest.

Date of ICOMOS approval of this report  
13 March 2019

2 Issues raised

Background  
The Maulbronn Monastery Complex was inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv) in 1993. At the time of inscription of the property, no buffer zone had been defined.

As noted in the brief description above, the water-management system at Maulbronn is an element of Outstanding Universal Value and its attributes comprise an elaborate network of drains, irrigation canals and reservoirs. However, at the time of inscription there was some uncertainty about which water-management features in the surrounding managed forest were actually part of the monastery water-management system.

The current minor boundary modification requests relate the modification of the property boundaries and the creation of a buffer zone.

Modification  
The State Party proposes to add a nett additional area of 2.5 ha to the property boundary, with a total property boundaries of 72.45 ha, and to create a buffer zone of 1,568.47 ha.

The proposed changes to the property boundaries are the addition or the removal of water management features from the property consistent with their being attributes or not attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value.

The State Party has undertaken a detailed survey of the historic water management system using high resolution airborne lasercans and extensive field research between 2014 and 2016. As a result, a more precise knowledge of the historic function of the ditches and pond system was obtained. It was found that the four small ponds southwest of the Zaisersweiher do not belong to the monastic water system but are more modern features that served as dew ponds or fire water ponds. There is also no functional connection of the mediaeval water system of the monastery with lake Eckhausee. However, the former lake Billensbacher See was an important functional element of the sequence of ponds in the Salzach valley beneath the monastery. This lake is dried up and partly developed, but nevertheless it is an important archaeological attribute of the historic water management system.

In total, five water management features are to be excluded and one feature is to be added.

The State Party presents the creation of a buffer zone comprising the valley of the river Salzach, where the walled monastery is situated at the end of the valley, surrounded by partly developed but largely wooded ridges. The criteria used to define the proposed buffer zone relate to protection requirements (minimum distances to ditches and pond edges), functional requirements (the water catchment area) as well as providing an area to protect the monastery and water system from visual impacts.

ICOMOS however notes that the maps, indicating the localisation of the proposed modifications, comprise two buffer zones: one located at the valley of the river Salzach, as described by the State Party in the documentation submitted, and another one located at the south eastern side of the first buffer zone.

Existing management arrangements for the property will continue to operate with the modified boundaries, including for the former lake Billensbacher See which will be added to the property.

A conceptual landscape document has been developed for the preservation, maintenance and development of the proposed buffer zone (Landschaftsplanerische Gesamtperspektive Kloster-landschaft Maulbronn 2012).
The existing legal protection for the World Heritage property will extend to the modified boundary. The existing property is, and the modified property will be, subject to the Monument Protection Act Baden-Württemberg. According to §8 and §15 of the Act, any modification to listed buildings or monuments requires permission by the monument protection authority.


ICOMOS notes that, as presented on the maps showing the extent of the proposed boundaries modifications and creation of buffer zone, the property is comprised of a series of several components, with the creation of two buffer zones. ICOMOS considers that the State Party should provide a table showing clearly the name of the component parts, their coordinates, areas extent and buffer zone, in order to clearly identify each component and each buffer zone, as prescribed by the Operational Guidelines p. 95, Annex 5.

ICOMOS considers that the proposed modifications to the property boundary and the identification of a buffer zone for the Maulbronn Monastery Complex will contribute to the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and strengthen its management.

3 ICOMOS Recommendations

Recommendation with respect to inscription
ICOMOS recommends that the proposed minor modification to the boundary for Maulbronn Monastery Complex, Germany, be approved.

ICOMOS recommends that the proposed creation of a buffer zone for Maulbronn Monastery Complex, Germany, be approved.

Additional recommendations
ICOMOS further recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:

a) Providing a clear table detailing each component part of the property, as well as the two buffer zones, as prescribed by the Operational Guidelines;
Map showing the revised boundaries of the property and the proposed buffer zone
University of Coimbra (Portugal) No 1387bis

1 Identification

State Party
Portugal

Name of the property
University of Coimbra – Alta and Sofia

Location
Beira Litoral, Baixo Mondego

Inscription
2013

Brief description
Situated on a hill overlooking the city, the University of Coimbra with its colleges grew and evolved over more than seven centuries within the old town. Notable university buildings include the 12th century Cathedral of Santa Cruz and a number of 16th century colleges, the Royal Palace of Alcâova, which has housed the University since 1537, the Joanine Library with its rich baroque decor, the 18th century Botanical Garden and the University Press, as well as the large “University City” created during the 1940s. The University’s edifices became a reference in the development of other institutions of higher education in the Portuguese-speaking world, where it also exerted a major influence on learning and literature. Coimbra offers an outstanding example of an integrated university city with a specific urban typology as well as its own ceremonial and cultural traditions that have been kept alive through the ages.

Date of ICOMOS approval of this report
13 March 2019

2 Issues raised

Background
The University of Coimbra — Alta and Sofia was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2013 on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi).

After the inscription of the property, the city of Coimbra suffered damage from two natural disasters: the flooding of the Mondego River in February 2016 and Cyclone Leslie in October 2018. The two disasters caused damage to buildings within the boundaries of the inscribed property and its buffer zone. The State Party set up emergency plans and created a compensation fund. Work to repair damage caused by Cyclone Leslie is still under way.

Modification
The State Party proposes adding to the inscribed property the Machado de Castro National Museum, with an area of 0.7 ha, located in what is currently the buffer zone. The proposed minor modification concerns the southern and western boundaries of the Alta component. The boundaries of the Sofia component will not be modified, and there will be no modification to the external boundaries of the buffer zone. The State Party argues that bringing this monument within the boundaries of the property is necessary to strengthen the property’s Outstanding Universal Value and will help maintain its integrity.

The Machado de Castro National Museum, which has enjoyed protected status as a national monument since 1910, is situated in the former archbishop’s palace, where the Roman forum of Aeminium once stood. The museum, inaugurated in 1911 and recently renovated, houses more than a hundred works of art with national interest or national treasure status. Most of the collections originate from the Coimbra region, and its monasteries, convents and churches, university colleges and dioceses.

During the inscription procedure, the museum building was undergoing renovation (2004-2012). A new building, which won the Piranesi/Prix de Rome Award in 2014, has now been added. The renovation involved a programme of archaeological, architectural and museographic interventions. The collections, and particularly those relating to the history of the University of Coimbra, are now displayed in a new permanent exhibition area. A project for the conservation and restoration of the Church of São João de Almedina, approved in 2017, has also been included in the Machado de Castro Museum renovation.

The State Party points out that the University of Coimbra and the Machado de Castro Museum have maintained a close relationship for centuries. This has led to the sharing of certain assets, and some of the collections are jointly managed. The building was not only the bishops’ residence, but also formed an integral part of the university’s teaching activity, although teaching in the bishops’ palace has not been continuous down the centuries. Today, courses in archaeology, architecture and history are taught in the building, reflecting the importance both of the remains discovered and the collections displayed there.

The Machado de Castro Museum comes under the responsibility of the Cultural Heritage Directorate of the Portuguese Ministry of Culture. The property is managed by the association RUAS [Recreating the Univers(c)ity – Alta and Sofia] created for this purpose, whose founder members are the University of Coimbra (UC), the Coimbra Municipal Council (CMC), the Regional Delegation of the Ministry of Culture (DRCG), and Coimbra Viva (an urban
The RUAS association is governed by a presidency (exercised alternately by the University of Coimbra and Coimbra Municipal Council) and by a board of directors charged with implementing the management plan. The Machado de Castro Museum already forms part of the RUAS association, and is joining its annual general meeting and its consultative forum. All proposed projects and interventions inside the boundaries of the inscribed property are presented in advance to the consultative forum of the RUAS association.

The State Party indicates that a master plan will be drawn up for the Machado de Castro Museum based on the same parameters and principles established for the other buildings in the inscribed property. Collaboration between the Machado de Castro Museum and the University of Coimbra, which has a range of university faculties and highly qualified departments and facilities, has been developed with an approach based on complementarity, articulation and sharing of resources, participation in international thematic networks and the definition of cultural and social programmes.

The legal protection of the proposed modification, as regards the boundaries of the property and buffer zone, is provided by the Decree-Law n° 107/2001 on the cultural heritage protection and enhancement policy and regime; announcement n° 14917/2013, published in the Diário da República, concerning the publication of the inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List, the protection of the property as a national monument and the definition of the special protection zone; announcement n° 2129/2012, published in the Diário da República, on the municipal regulations for the building, and the restoration and repurposing of the urban area covered by the application of the University of Coimbra for UNESCO World Heritage listing, including the buffer zone; announcement n° 7635/2014, published in the Diário da República, relating to the master plan for Coimbra Municipal Council; and the Coimbra Strategic Plan, approved in 2010.

The proposed modification does not alter the existing legal protection in any way, as the whole zone is protected by the same laws and regulations. The various components of the property are protected by their status as national monuments, in accordance with Law 107/2001, no. 7, article 15.

The Museum was reopened to the public in 2012 on completion of the extension. The new volumes, though decidedly modern in appearance, do not detract from the heterogeneous architectural whole which they help to form. Like the other components of the inscribed property, the Machado de Castro Museum is representative of the historic, artistic and ideological periods during which it was built. The conservation, restoration and rehabilitation interventions were conducted on the basis of the theories that held sway in each successive period.

ICOMOS considers that the governing body of the Machado de Castro Museum must be made an integral part of the management structure of the inscribed property, and that agreements must be put in place for the management and upkeep of the building and its collection.

ICOMOS considers that the proposed modifications of boundaries for the University of Coimbra and its buffer zone contribute to a strengthening of the property’s integrity, and its management and visitor presentation.

3 ICOMOS recommendations

Recommendations with respect to inscription
ICOMOS recommends that the proposed minor modification to the boundaries of the University of Coimbra – Alta and Sofia, Portugal, be approved.

Additional recommendations
ICOMOS also recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following points:

a) Drawing up a master plan for the Machado de Castro Museum,

b) Submitting the management plan, once finalised, to the World Heritage Centre for examination.
Map showing both delimitations of the Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer Description</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original World Heritage Area boundaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed addition to World Heritage Area boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Buffer Zone boundary (without changes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

World Heritage Areas
1 - Alta Universitária
2 - Rua da Sofia

Map showing the revised boundaries of the property
Royal Domain of Drottningholm (Sweden)  
No 559bis

1 Basic data

State Party  
Sweden

Name of property  
Royal Domain of Drottningholm

Location  
The island of Lovön, Province of Stockholm, Ekerö Municipalit

Inscription  
1991

Brief description  
The Royal Domain of Drottningholm stands on an island in Lake Mälär in a suburb of Stockholm. With its castle, perfectly preserved theatre (built in 1766), Chinese pavilion and gardens, it is the finest example of an 18th century north European royal residence inspired by the Palace of Versailles.

Date of ICOMOS approval of this report  
13 March 2019

2 Issues raised

Background  
The Royal Domain of Drottningholm was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991 on the basis of criterion (iv). The retrospective statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the property, approved in 2016 (40 COM 8E), defines the ensemble of Drottningholm as "the best example of a royal residence built in the 18th century in Sweden, [...] representative of all European architecture of that period, heir to the influences exerted by the Chateau of Versailles on the construction of royal residences in western, central and northern Europe."

The buffer zone was not required at the time of inscription. However, the need was regularly highlighted throughout management and monitoring, including the Periodic Report submitted by the State Party (2006) as well as ICOMOS reports prepared in the process of discussion of the remodeling of the Ekerö road and construction of the Stockholm bypass. In 2009, the Swedish government allowed the Stockholm Bypass to be constructed with the condition that Lovön-Kårsön, a larger land and water area around the World Heritage property should be established as a natural or cultural reserve, enhancing the protection and preservation of the World Heritage property. As a result, the Lovön Nature Reserve was established by the decision of the Stockholm Administrative Board in 2014, with the purpose of conservation of large peri-urban cultural and natural landscape, its valuable natural habitats, its values for recreational use and the values connected to historically contiguous agricultural use of the landscape having a strong reference to the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property. The comprehensive Heritage Impact Assessments, developed in conformity with ICOMOS recommendations, in the process of designing of the above mentioned infrastructure projects, indicated the relevance of the area of the nature reserve to the objectives of the World Heritage buffer zone. The area of the reserve allowed safeguarding and support of the property’s Outstanding Universal Value and demonstrated clear link between the character of the landscape and its historical agricultural use with the purpose to support the Crown’s need of supplies and to uphold the King’s household.

In 2018, as a result of the lengthy process of assessment and consultation, the State Party presented official request for Minor Boundary Modification, proposing the buffer zone to be established for the Royal Domain of Drottningholm.

Modification  
The proposed buffer zone covers 3,227.6 ha and corresponds to the boundaries of the Lovön Nature Reserve, covering the islands Lovön, Kårsön, Fågelön, surrounding islands, islets and the water area.

As the area has strong cultural character linked with the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property, the boundaries of the nature reserve have been delineated with participation of specialists for both natural and cultural components. The objective of the nature reserve is to ensure safeguarding, conservation and maintenance of the natural and cultural environment of the designated peri-urban area, its natural habitats as well as historical agricultural and recreational use. The reserve does not include the territory of the World Heritage property, however presents an added layer of protection to it and supports the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The part of the territory is also designated as an area of national interest for cultural heritage which implies that its value must not be significantly damaged and should be given priority in planning on local and regional level.

The proposed buffer zone allows better understanding of the value and significance of the World Heritage property, ensuring long term preservation of the agricultural landscape which has been owned by the Crown and serving its need for supplies for centuries.
The proposed buffer zone also allows preservation of the visual and ideological relation of the World Heritage property to its wider landscape surroundings, setting the classical gardens within the natural and agricultural landscape context, and through uninterrupted horizon, highlighting the symbolic expression of the absolute power of the Crown, expressing the domination of man over nature and territory.

The proposal for the buffer zone was developed jointly by the Stockholm County Administrative Board, the National Property Board of Sweden and Ekerö Municipality with the participation of local residents and landowners. The management of the territory is the responsibility of the National Property Board of Sweden, which is the owner of the territories of the reserve. The management plan, approved in 2014, is the subject of renewal every decade.

The Stockholm County Administrative Board oversees the implementation of the regulations and assesses any modifications within the reserve against the purpose and directions for the establishment of the reserve. A special consultative group led by the National Property Board brings together all stakeholders to ensure harmonization of interests and actions, in conformity with the objectives for preservation and presentation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property in connection with the nature reserve.

Within the perimeter of Lovön, there are properties that are owned or leased and that are not included in the reserve and its provisions. Any changes to these properties are controlled by the municipality under the provisions of the Swedish Planning and Building Act (2010:900), there are agreements in place for the leased land with the National Property Board Sweden and Office of the Governor that regulate which modifications are permitted. These properties are also part of the area of national interest for cultural environment, meaning that through the county administrative board, the State superintends municipal decisions.

The legal framework for protection and management is provided by the Swedish Environmental Code (1998:808), as well as the Planning and Building Act (2010:900), the Ekerö Municipality Master Plan (2010), the detailed development plan for Drottningholmsmalmén (2015) as well as the Ordinance for State Owned Buildings (2013:558).

ICOMOS considers the proposed buffer zone will enhance and contribute to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property. The strong legal protection afforded for the nature reserve and the existing management arrangements provide sufficient justification for the proposed buffer zone to be effectively implemented.

3 ICOMOS Recommendations

Recommendation with respect to inscription
ICOMOS recommends that the proposed buffer zone for the Royal Domain of Drottningholm, Sweden, be approved.

Additional recommendations
ICOMOS further recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:

a) Developing a new integrated management plan for the World Heritage property and the buffer zone, including a Spatial Development Plan, covering the County Administrative Board and Ekerö municipality, as well as a comprehensive mobility plan;
Map showing the proposed buffer zone
Arles, Roman and Romanesque Monuments
(France)
No 164bis

1 Basic data
State Party
France
Name of property
Arles, Roman and Romanesque Monuments
Location
Arles
Inscription
1981
Brief description
Arles is a good example of the adaptation of an ancient city to medieval European civilization. It has some impressive Roman monuments, of which the earliest are the arena, the Roman theatre and the cryptoporticus (subterranean galleries) – date back to the 1st century B.C. During the 4th century Arles experienced a second golden age, as attested by the baths of Constantine and the necropolis of Alyscamps. In the 11th and 12th centuries, Arles once again became one of the most attractive cities in the Mediterranean. Within the city walls, Saint-Trophime, with its cloister, is one of Provence’s major Romanesque monuments.

Date of ICOMOS approval of this report
13 mars 2019

2 Issues raised
Background
The property Arles, Roman and Romanesque Monuments was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1981, on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv). In 2006, the State Party proposed the name to be changed to “Arles, Roman and Romanesque Monuments”, under the request for changes to names of properties (decision 30 COM 8B.8). In 2011, as part of the Retrospective inventory, the property was modified in order to correspond to the perimeter of the protected area to which was added the classified site of the Alyscamps. In 2018, the French State approved the proposed Buffer zone.

Modification
The World Heritage property of Arles, Roman and Romanesque Monuments was inscribed with a total area of 65 ha. The proposed buffer zone is proposed to cover an area of 224 ha.

According to the State Party, the proposed buffer zone was defined by taking into consideration: “the archaeological context and the progressive improvement of knowledge; the current urban development, some project areas, and preservation of Arles’ Outstanding Universal Value”. The landscape and the urban perspectives were also considered in the selection of a suitable area for the buffer zone. Since the 17th century, an abundant historical iconography offers views of the city from the right bank. This symbolises the important visual link that is developed from the banks of the river.

Located on a 25 m high hill on the banks of the Rhône, the historic town and its iconic monuments form a skyline that is spotted several kilometres away. Its composition is punctuated by a series of vertical elements constituted by major heritage buildings: the bell tower of Saint-Trophime, the belfry of the town hall, the church of the Major, the amphitheatre and its towers, and the bell tower of Cordeliers. The historical skyline has been very stable since the 17th century, with the predominance of the bell tower of Saint-Trophime, an element symbolizing the Romanesque period that stands out for its height and proportions.

The Safeguarding and Enhancement Plan (Plan de Sauvegarde et de Mise en Valeur) (PSMV) manages the World Heritage property of Arles, Roman and Romanesque Monuments. The PSMV was approved on 18 April 2018 and contains clear rules on the protection of elements such as the Roman Circus, and the site of Mouleyres, both bearing important values.

The proposed buffer zone will be managed by the municipality according to the Local Urban Plan (PLU), which was approved on 8 March 2017, and includes the Planning Guidance and Heritage Programming. According to the State Party, to ensure long-term protection and preservation, it is foreseen that the buffer zone, once approved will be endowed with a significant heritage site protection, managed by an Architectural and Heritage Enhancement Plan (Plan de valorisation de l’Architecture et du Patrimoine) (PVAP). This plan will have public utility easement and will be annexed to the PLU.

According to the State Party, the major decisions regarding the property are made by the Local Commission of Arles World Heritage (commission local du patrimoine mondial d’Arles), which is chaired by the Regional Prefect. This Local Commission ensures the implementation of the management plan and guarantees that there is transversality between the various services. The management is addressed by the city of Arles with the following State services: the Regional Conservation...
of Historical Monuments; the Departmental Unit of Architecture and Heritage (with the Architect of Buildings of France); and the Regional Service of Archaeology. The State services that constitute the Local Commission meet to jointly manage the instruction of work permits, to be issued for the protected areas.

In the proposed buffer zone, at the Anciens Ateliers SNCF, it is currently being built a 56 m tower from the architect Frank Gehry for the foundation LUMA. The high structure known as Luma Arles Tower is in the immediate vicinity of the inscribed property. The important proportions of the massive structure, characterised by new materials and dynamic forms creates a disruptive relation with the legacy from the Gallo-Roman necropolis along the ancient Roman road. Its modern shape stands out above the city visual profile, and interferes with the visual integrity of the historical skyline of the property. The proposed Minor Boundaries Modification did not mention the Luma tower project, neither the fact that the tower was already under construction; however, it did underline the importance of the historical skyline of the city of Arles and the fact that it did not change since the 17th century.

Luma Arles is presently under construction, which means that the Local Commission and the specific State Services that constitute it, and should protect the property, approved the tower. Luma Arles tower will have potential negative visual impacts on the property and its Outstanding universal value. The World Heritage Centre did not receive information about the tower project and its construction, according to paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

ICOMOS considers that the fact that the tower is already being built reveals that the legal framework in place, the management plan, as well as the mechanisms for protection of the property and of its buffer zone did not prevent the tower from being built.

ICOMOS also considers that the criteria which were followed to establish the boundaries of the buffer zone remain unclear, as a robust justification for their delineation was not provided. The proposed buffer zone should also include areas with high potential in terms of archaeological deposits. The buffer zone should ensure that the historical skyline of Arles World Heritage property is maintained and it should also prevent from real estate development projects to be built too close to the property.

3 ICOMOS Recommendations

Recommendation with respect to inscription
ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the proposed buffer zone for Arles, Roman and Romanesque Monuments, France be referred back to the State Party, in order to allow it to:

- Provide a clear rationale regarding the delineation of the buffer zone, and the reason why some areas are included and others are not,
- Provide specific documentation and details regarding building regulations, and how they prevent new buildings to disrupt the historical skyline of the World Heritage property.
- Provide the Heritage Impact Assessment undertaken for the Luma Arles tower, and its relation with the World Heritage property. In case of non-existence of an HIA, provide the recommendations that were presented by State Services, regarding the construction of the Luma Arles tower,
- Deliver a Visual Impact Analysis of the Luma Arles tower on the property and its Outstanding Universal Value;
Map showing the proposed buffer zone.
Venice and its Lagoon (Italy)
No 394bis

1 Basic data

State Party
Italy

Name of property
Venice and its Lagoon

Location
Province of Venezia, Veneto Region

Inscription
1987

Brief description
The property comprises the city of Venice and its lagoon. Founded in the 5th century and spread over 118 small islands, Venice became a major maritime power in the 10th century. The whole city is an extraordinary architectural masterpiece in which even the smallest building contains works by some of the world’s greatest artists such as Giorgione, Titian, Tintoretto, Veronese and others. Venice and its lagoon landscape is the result of a dynamic process which illustrates the interaction between people and the ecosystem of their natural environment over time.

Date of ICOMOS approval of this report
13 March 2019

2 Issues raised

Background
Venice and its Lagoon was inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi) in 1987. At the time of its inscription no buffer zone was defined.

As part of a state of conservation report submitted in 2014, the State Party included a Management Plan which included a proposal for the establishment of a buffer zone. The World Heritage Committee noted the proposal, invited the State Party to undertake its revision in line with an ICOMOS technical review, to submit it to the World Heritage Centre as a minor boundary modification in 2015, and requested the State Party to invite a joint UNESCO/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to consider a range of matters, including progress with the buffer zone (Decision 38 COM 7B.27).

In its 2014 technical review, ICOMOS requested the buffer zone, ‘should be grounded on an overall interdisciplinary study that gives particular relevance to the hydrological and hydro-geomorphological factors and clarifies which areas, features and processes are functionally linked to the inscribed property and should therefore be taken into consideration to guarantee that the attributes of its Outstanding Universal Value are protected and conserved.’

A state of conservation report in 2015 noted the buffer zone proposal was being further developed. The World Heritage Committee also considered the findings of the reactive monitoring mission, which did not have the capacity to assess the proposal in detail. However, the mission suggested a detailed description be developed to justify the proposed buffer zone. The World Heritage Committee reiterated its earlier decision, requesting submission of the proposal in 2016 (Decision 40 COM 7B.52).

A state of conservation report was submitted in 2017 noting the buffer zone proposal was being considered by stakeholders and its submission was planned for 2018. The World Heritage Committee requested the State Party continue to implement the recommendations made in 2016 in Decision 40 COM 7B.52 (Decision 41 COM 7B.48)

Modification
The State Party proposes a buffer zone of 511,028.21 ha.

In addition, the State Party notes a correction to the property area arising from more accurate digitised mapping. The corrected property area is 70,176.40 ha compared to the original area based on paper maps of 70,882.29 ha.

The proposed extensive buffer zone is in three areas, called Territorial Areas, related to the: drainage basin of the Venice lagoon and the coastal-marine waters facing the gulf of Venice; Adriatic coastline, Venice Lagoon and Po Delta; and the perimeter of the Venice Metropolitan City. Each area has a different nature and function.

These areas rely on different protection/management tools and combine to provide a framework to strengthen the protection and integrity of the property from several perspectives: environmental; historical/landscape; and strategic/management. Mapping of these aspects has been undertaken to inform the development of the buffer zone.

The size and function of the buffer zone were determined by analysing the pressures/threats on the Outstanding Universal Value arising from outside the property. The main identified pressures/threats are:

- ecological and chemical pollution of water and soil;
- soil consumption;
- river flooding;
• erosion of the coastline and shores of the lagoon;
• sea level change and subsidence due to climate change and water extraction;
• subsoil methane gas;
• soil uses involving activities that are incompatible and unsustainable with the environmental characteristics and cultural and landscape values of the property; and
• alteration of the landscape, in particular that of the lagoon and coastlines, with the construction of structures, buildings and infrastructure works that are incongruous and incompatible with the values of the property.

The buffer zone has been formulated to allow for the coordination of actions already in progress at the different administrative and planning levels for the protection of Outstanding Universal Value. It defines the safety limit of the buffer zone within which all the measures for the prevention and/or mitigation of external pressures are defined and implemented, even those that originate outside the buffer zone.

The buffer zone is intended to contribute to the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value by:
• protecting the hydrographic network and waterways of the drainage basin and the coastal-marine waters, in terms of reducing pollution, hydraulic risk prevention, and monitoring of the ecological and chemical quality of the water;
• safeguarding the environment and the morphological and hydro-geological elements;
• maintaining/restoring the ecological balance with active conservation of natural areas and of connection networks, protection of the hydrographic network, and defence of rural areas;
• protecting and enhancing the historical-cultural heritage as a system comprising the architectural complexes, historical settlements, networks of the cultural landscape and the underwater archaeological heritage;
• protecting the landscape and maintaining the spatial, visual and perceptive relations of the assets, of their historical settlements and the landscape values of the property in their complexity and unity;
• promoting a better use of the territorial system, including with the development of territorial enhancement and tourism promotion networks by creating a coordinated and integrated system of infrastructure and services management associated with those existing in the protected area aimed at sustainable use; and
• managing the territory in a coordinated manner and the enhancement of the property in terms of strategies for mobility and sustainable tourism.

The management of the buffer zone is closely related to the coordinated management of the property, which aims to define and to trial a sustainable development model.

The Management Plan is being updated and will define objectives, challenges and activities related to the property and buffer zone.

The multi-level governance model is being studied further, which will allow direct participation of the institutional actors of the Territorial Areas included in the buffer zone, depending on the level of protection and discipline exerted by relevant plans, and for reporting to the Steering Committee for the property.

The governance system for the coordinated management, enhancement and sustainable development of the buffer zone could be realised within about a three-year period, with the final approval of the Regional Landscape Area Plan of the Adriatic coastline, Venice lagoon and Po Delta (now at a preliminary draft stage), the Strategic Metropolitan Plan (adopted in July 2018) and the General Territorial Plan of the Metropolitan City (being processed), and with the approval of the Property Management Plan through the signing of a Programme Agreement.

Each of the Territorial Areas has its own protection system based in specific legal instruments (territorial and sectoral plans) whose rules and guidelines reflect the thematic levels of the buffer zone: environmental protection, historical-landscape protection, and coordinated management of territory from a strategic/metropolitan perspective.

These existing territorial and sectoral planning tools provide effective legal protection for the buffer zone. Such tools include the Master Plan 2000 on reducing pollution, the forthcoming regional Landscape Plan under the Code on Cultural Heritage and Landscape, the Venice Metropolitan City Plan, and Territorial Layout Plans under the Regional Law 11/2004.

Such tools are used by bodies covering the broad area (Regions and Provinces/Venice Metropolitan City) and the municipalities, in a framework of overall consistency and hierarchically structured in terms of subsidiarity.

ICOMOS notes the reason for the large proposed buffer zone is founded on the necessity to add protection not only to the cultural heritage and its visual appreciation, but also to the natural environment preserving the lagoon, the quality of its water and the balance of its sand features, as requested in 2014. These aspects are crucial.

The proposed buffer zone includes varied landscape features, from highly natural parts such as the lagoon and delta, to urbanised contexts and sprawl. The buffer zone extends from the vast landscape of the Venetian hinterland to the sea, whose contribution to the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value requires a systematic approach.

The buffer zone correctly extends beyond the political-administrative borders of the Venice Metropolitan City, as such an area would be insufficient. The proposed buffer
zone appropriately covers the entire drainage basin of the lagoon to the north where the main rivers drain into the lagoon, the northwest to include the landscapes of eastern Veneto, and to the southeast to include the area of the Po delta.

The drainage basin is the territory whose surface water network discharges into the Venice lagoon. The choice of including the whole drainage basin in the proposed buffer zone is valuable from the hydraulic and hydrogeological point of view because it ensures that the whole territory contributing water, sediment and dissolved loads to the Venice lagoon will undergo the same regulations. The planning tools and measures aimed at controlling the quality of the waters draining in the Venice lagoon are adequately described in the proposal. The drainage basin is characterized by a dense population, intensive agriculture, widespread productive activities, and important transport routes: all these conditions make especially challenging the implementation of water control measures.

In addition, the inclusion of the peri-lagoon area and the coastal-marine strip are important. This relates to environmental concerns but also to the historic relationship of Venice and its lagoon to the Venetian hinterland and to the Adriatic Sea.

There are four existing water bodies in the coastal strip (Figure 7) although only three of them are included within the proposed buffer zone. The State Party should be invited to provide rationale for the exclusion of this water body and reconsider the exclusion of a part of the southern coastal strip from the proposed buffer zone.

The rationale for the delineation of the boundaries of the proposed buffer zone is consistent with the objective of ensuring a uniform management perspective in the frame of the Strategic Metropolitan Plan of Venice.

ICOMOS considers that the proposed buffer zone will contribute to reinforce the integrity of the World Heritage property and will contribute to manage this vast territory (three provinces -Venice, Padova, Treviso- and 132 municipalities) in a coordinated manner. However, the State Party is invited to sign a Programme Agreement in order to officially establish this coordinated management.

3 ICOMOS Recommendations

Recommendation with respect to inscription

ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the proposed buffer zone for Venice and its Lagoon, Italy, be referred back to the State Party in order to allow it to:

- Provide clarification why one of the water body has been excluded from the proposed buffer zone and reconsider the exclusion of this part of the southern coastal strip from the proposed buffer zone;
- Sign a Programme Agreement in order to put in place officially the governance system for the coordinated management, enhancement and sustainable development of the proposed buffer zone;
Map showing the proposed buffer zone
1 Basic data

State Party
Norway

Name of property
Bryggen

Location
City of Bergen, County of Hordaland

Inscription
1979

Brief description
Bryggen, the old wharf of Bergen, is a reminder of the town’s importance as part of the Hanseatic League’s trading empire from the 14th to the mid-16th century. Many fires, the last in 1955, have ravaged the characteristic wooden houses of Bryggen. Its rebuilding has traditionally followed old patterns and methods, thus leaving its main structure preserved, which is a relic of an ancient wooden urban structure once common in Northern Europe. Today, some 62 buildings remain of this former townscape.

Date of ICOMOS approval of this report
13 March 2019

2 Issues raised

Background
When Bryggen was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979, on the basis of criterion (iii), there were no requirements for buffer zones, and the World Heritage property has since inscription not had a formalised buffer zone approved by the World Heritage Committee. The local area plan was developed by local authorities to protect the World Heritage property and cultural heritage in the area, including the close linkages between the medieval street patterns, the built environment and the connection to the sea. The local area plan protecting the World Heritage property was adopted on 11 December 2006, but has not yet been formalised through the World Heritage Committee. The World Heritage Council for Bryggen requested in its meeting of 17 December 2018, the Norwegian Directorate for Cultural Heritage to submit the local area plan (Plan ID 16040000), as buffer zone for Bryggen World Heritage property.

Modification
The World Heritage property of Bryggen is inscribed with a total area of 1,196 ha. The proposed buffer zone will be a wider area with a total of 27 ha. The buffer zone proposal corresponds exactly to the already existing and adopted local area plan and protection plan, which provides legal protection through the Norwegian Planning and Building Act. The current protection plan includes an extensive area which today functions as a buffer zone (local area plan with special conservation area regulations, adopted in 2006). The buffer zone proposal may be considered a formalisation of existing management and protection mechanisms for Bryggen.

According to the State Party, the current local area plan was intended to act as a buffer for the World Heritage property, already when adopted in 2006. The plan defines and maintains important sightlines, the visual integrity of the larger area, and it provides legal provisions for the protection of the World Heritage property, other cultural heritage and the buffer zone.

Relevant to refer is the on-going pressure for urban development in the vicinity of Bryggen. According to the State Party, the cultural heritage authorities and the on-site World Heritage coordinator closely monitor any developments that may have visual impact or other impacts in Bryggen.

ICOMOS considers that in general, the proposed buffer zone is well justified and protection mechanisms are already in place. However, in the northeast part of the World Heritage site, the buffer zone area should be further extended. In Øvregaten Street, which limits the northeast of Bryggen property, the proposed buffer zone is too narrow, just covering few meters beyond the property. This is not enough to fully protect the World Heritage property. The fact that it is an urban area in a higher location, with the property hiding behind tall trees is not adequate to justify such a narrow strip of buffer zone. Also, the proposed limit of the buffer zone crosses the middle of the buildings, which is not efficient in terms of protection. The State Party should give consideration to widen the buffer zone limit in this area and, it should follow the real-estate limits of the buildings.

Furthermore, there are plans for a tram track to pass through the buffer zone, close to the World Heritage property. This factor could affect the relationship of the buffer zone with the property, but it could in particular have a negative impact on Bryggen’s Outstanding Universal Value. If the planned tram track is approved to pass between Bryggen and the port that connects to the sea, the Outstanding Universal Value of the property could be impacted.
3 ICOMOS Recommendations

**Recommendation with respect to inscription**
ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the proposed buffer zone for Bryggen, Norway, be referred back to the State Party, in order to allow it to:

- Extend the buffer zone to include a wider area in the northeast part of the property, as it could prevent urban pressure to directly impact the World Heritage property; or to provide a clear and solid rationale for the exclusion of this area,

- Undertake an Heritage Impact Assessment regarding the future tram track that will pass in the buffer zone, to assess the potential impact on Bryggen’s Outstanding Universal Value;
Map showing the proposed buffer zone
Churches of Chiloé
(Chile)
No 971bis

1 Basic data

State Party
Chile

Name of property
Churches of Chiloé

Location
Municipalities of Castro, Chonchi, Dalcahue, Puqueldón, Quemchi, and Quinchao
Chiloé Province
X Región de los Lagos

Inscription
2000

Brief description
The Churches of Chiloé represent a unique example in Latin America of an outstanding form of ecclesiastical wooden architecture. They represent a tradition initiated by the Jesuit Peripatetic Mission in the 17th and 18th centuries, continued and enriched by the Franciscans during the 19th century and still prevailing today. These churches embody the intangible richness of the Chiloé Archipelago, and bear witness to a successful fusion of indigenous and European culture, the full integration of its architecture in the landscape and environment, as well as to the spiritual values of the communities.

Date of ICOMOS approval of this report
13 March 2019

2 Issues raised

Background
At the meeting of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in June 2000, the nomination was referred back to the State Party, requesting the definition of buffer zones around each of the churches and the definition of standards of control over development within these zones. After provision of maps including buffer zones for each of the components, the serial property was inscribed in December 2000 on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii), by Decision CONF 204 X.C.1. Those original buffer zones consisted, in some cases, in narrow areas that did not completely surrounded the component parts areas.

After the construction of a shopping mall in the town of Castro, where one of the components of the serial property is located, by Decision 37 COM 7B.94 (2013), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre – ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to address, among other elements, the definition of the characteristics of the wider settings for all component parts, in relation to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and put in place appropriate protection, including the review of the buffer zones and regulatory measures for the protection of the setting of the Churches of Chiloé. The reactive monitoring mission was carried out on 3-6 December 2013; among the recommendations, the mission requested to submit a Minor Boundary Modification for the property, in line with the procedures and requirements set up on the Operational Guidelines, to establish a final proposal for the buffer zones and wider setting for each of the components of the serial property. The documentation should include precise boundaries delimited in maps with the definition of the characteristics of each zone, as well as the related regulatory measures to ensure proper protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property; and protect the surrounding areas, including the immediate zones with vernacular architecture, the buffer zones and the wider setting composed by the natural landscape.

By Decision 38 COM 7B.40 (2014), the World Heritage Committee endorsed the Mission report recommendations, and urged the State Party to finalize the legal definition of buffer zones and visually sensitive areas around each component and establish the appropriate legislative measures to ensure the overall protection of the property. This recommendation was reiterated in 2015 by Decision 39 COM 7B.89 and in 2017 by Decision 41 COM 7B.59.

From 2013 onwards, the State Party has worked on a comprehensive plan for the protection of the surroundings of the churches as a Typical Zones, in the framework of Law 17,288 on Historic Monuments. Preliminary Protection Areas (APP) were defined, as a first step for adequate protection. A participatory process, which included local communities associated to the churches, was implemented to carry out this task. In 2016 and 2018, ICOMOS elaborated technical reviews on the proposed preliminary protection areas.

Modification
In January 2019, the Decrees of protection of the extended buffer zones as Typical Zones were approved for 10 components out of 16, while the others are in the process of approval. The present request for minor boundary modification is addressed to those 10 components for which the protection is in place; these are the churches in Chelín, Chonchi, Colo, Detif, Ichuac, Nercón, Quinchao, San Juan, Tenaún and Vilupulli. During 2019, the State Party will begin the official formalization work of the new Decrees and legal plans,
with the current work standards and the corrected surfaces.

The designation of Typical Zone is intended to protect the environmental and specific character of areas where archaeological sites or buildings designated Historic Monuments are located. The Council of National Monuments must analyse and supervises any intervention within the boundaries of a Typical Zone in accordance with the protected values and attributes. The Council must ensure that each zone has Intervention Guidelines, which are defined as the technical documents that guide the conservation of those zones, in order to guarantee their protection and maintenance over time, according to the Regulation on Typical or Picturesque Zones, which promotes the adequacy of the Communal Regulatory Plans with the Rules of Intervention, in order to harmonize both instruments according to the characteristics of heritage protection.

The criteria for the extension of the buffer zones have been the consideration of environmental cultural landscape units, including coastal edge, hills, mounds, vegetation, natural or anthropic boundaries (streams, gorges, fences, roads); the components of each church (atrium, cemetery, grottos, parish houses, paths, fences); the coastal edge and its elements (docks, ramps, pier, beach); important visual cones for the perception of the church, specifically its tower, from the sea and from the access roads to each locality; the archipelago's architectonical and urban characteristic typologies; adequate distance for the perception of the properties attributes regarding the insertion of the church in the landscape; preservation of the historical urban pattern, as an historical vestige of the settlement; and communal agreement regarding the regulation decisions. In addition, intangible cultural heritage aspects have also been considered, such as religious activities related to the use of the surroundings of the churches by the communities.

ICOMOS considers that the proposed buffer zones can be considered adequate for the following components: Chelín, Colo, Detif, Icuch, Nercón and Vilupulli; the extended buffer zones are in coincidence with the designation of Typical Zones and respond to previous recommendations on the protection of the surroundings of the churches. In some cases, the designation of Typical Zones coincides with the previous Preliminary Protection Area or have even been extended. For the other components, some observations can be expressed.

In Chonchi, the proposed buffer zone includes a large section of Centenario Street, which represents a particular typology of the Chilote urbanism and where, in addition to the church, there are high-value constructions for the area. It also includes an area of 80 meters, from the sea to the coastal edge, incorporating the dock of the town. It is recommendable, however, that the buffer zone includes the area behind the church, where the topography and vegetation are important as part of the church's setting, as proposed in the Preliminary Protection Area.

In Quinchao, although the proposed minor boundary modification includes part of the surrounding landscape, coastal and sea areas, it is recommended that the buffer zone be enlarged behind the church to include, within the boundaries of the protected zone, the topography and the existing vegetation, as proposed in the Preliminary Protection Area.

In the case of San Juan, the proposed buffer zone includes the esplanade of the church, its associated cemetery and a large sector with housing; it also includes the San Juan estuary area that faces the church and the northeast side of the most immediate hill, in order to protect the views towards the church and the environmental value of the place. It is recommended, however, that the buffer zone includes a larger area of the surrounding landscape, with its topography and vegetation, as proposed in the Preliminary Protection Area.

In Tenaún, the proposed buffer zone includes a section of the main road of the town, with its median strip and its linearly arranged constructions running parallel to the coastal edge; it also includes a sea area 80 meters deep from the highest tide line. It is recommended, however, that the buffer zone includes part of the surrounding landscape, with its topography and vegetation, as proposed in the Preliminary Protection Area.

In the cases of Chonchi, Quinchao, San Juan and Tenaún, the State Party has declared, in the documentation received, that further extensions of the proposed buffer zones will be done at a later stage of the minor boundary modification process, in a work closely connected with the community associated with the churches.

In addition to the proposed buffer zones, the State Party provided a chart rectifying the administrative errors that occurred when inscribing the property, in relation to the extent of the component parts areas. For the component parts of Rilán and Nercón Churches, the areas of respectively 0.64 ha and 0.7 ha were inversely written in the UNESCO website's chart. As regards the Churches of Aldachildo, Detif, Colo, San Juan and Dalcahue, the extent of the "cemeteries" and "ecclesiastic site" were not correctly reported on the registration file.

ICOMOS acknowledges the amendments made by the State Party as regards the extent of the mentioned component parts. However, ICOMOS notes that the table indicating the correct extents still needs to be completed for Churches of Achaoo, of Castro, of Rilán, of Adalchilo and of Dalcahue, and that it would be necessary to provide the final extent area for each component parts in hectares.
3 ICOMOS Recommendations

Recommendation with respect to inscription
ICOMOS recommends that the proposed minor modification to the boundaries of the buffer zones for the components Chelín, Colo, Detif, Ichuac, Nercón and Villipulli of the serial property Churches of Chiloé, Chile, be approved.

ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the proposed minor modification to the boundary of the buffer zone of the component Chonchi of the serial property Churches of Chiloé, Chile, be referred back to the State Party in order to allow it to:

- Extend the proposed buffer zone to include the area behind the church, where the topography and vegetation are important as part of the church’s setting;

ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the proposed minor modification to the boundary of the buffer zone of the component Quinchao of the serial property Churches of Chiloé, Chile, be referred back to the State Party in order to allow it to:

- Extend the proposed buffer zone to include the area behind the church to include, within the boundaries of the protected zone, the topography and the existing vegetation;

ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the proposed minor modification to the boundary of the buffer zone of the component San Juan of the serial property Churches of Chiloé, Chile, be referred back to the State Party in order to allow it to:

- Extend the proposed buffer zone to include a larger area of the surrounding landscape, with its topography and vegetation, as proposed in the Preliminary Protection Area;

ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the proposed minor modification to the boundary of the buffer zone of the component Tenaún of the serial property Churches of Chiloé, Chile, be referred back to the State Party in order to allow it to:

- Extend the proposed buffer zone to include a larger part of the surrounding landscape, with its topography and vegetation;

Additional recommendations
ICOMOS further recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:

a) Completing the table showing clearly the exact extent of each component part of the property in hectares,

b) Finalizing the identification of buffer zones around the remaining churches of Castro and Caguach and conclude the process for the churches of Achao, Rilán, Aldachildo and Dalcahue,

c) Providing the Intervention Guidelines for all Typical Zones of the property,

d) Urgently establishing a Management Plan for the property, the proposed Buffer Zones and the wider setting;
Map showing the proposed buffer zone of the component 002, Nuestra Señora de Gracia de Quinchao church

Map showing the proposed buffer zone of the component 005, Nuestra Señora de Gracia de Nercón church
Map showing the proposed buffer zone of the component 007, Natividad de María de Ichuac church

Map showing the proposed buffer zone of the component 008, Santiago Apóstol de Detif church
Map showing the proposed buffer zone of the component 009, San Antonio de Vilupulli church

Map showing the proposed buffer zone of the component 010, San Carlos Borromeo de Chonchi church
Map showing the proposed buffer zone of the component 011, Nuestra Señora del Patrocinio de Tenaún church

Map showing the proposed buffer zone of the component 012, San Antonio de Colo church
Map showing the proposed buffer zone of the component 013, San Juan Bautista de San Juan church

Map showing the proposed buffer zone of the component 015, Nuestra Señora del Rosario de Chelín church
Humberstone and Santa Laura (Chile)
No 1178ter

1 Basic data

State Party
Chile

Name of property
Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works

Location
Tarapacá Region, Province of Iquique

Inscription
2005

Brief description
Humberstone and Santa Laura contain over 200 former saltpetre works where workers from Chile, Peru and Bolivia lived in company towns and forged a distinctive communal pampinos culture. That culture is manifested in their rich language, creativity, and solidarity, and, above all, in their pioneering struggle for social justice, which had a profound impact on social history. Situated in one of the driest deserts on Earth, thousands of pampinos lived and worked in this hostile environment for over 60 years, from 1880, to process the largest deposit of saltpetre in the world, producing the fertilizer sodium nitrate that was to transform agricultural lands in North and South America, and in Europe, and produce great wealth for Chile. Because of the vulnerability of the structures and the impact of an earthquake, the site was also inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger to help mobilize resources for its conservation.

Date of ICOMOS approval of this report
13 March 2019

2 Issues raised

Background
The property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2005 on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv) by Decision 29 COM 8B.51. Taking into account the ascertained threats to the vulnerable structures of the property, and in order to support the urgent and necessary consolidation work, by Decision 29 COM 8B.52, the property was inscribed at the same time on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

At the time of inscription, the boundary of the property coincided with that of the designation as National Monument; the surface of the inscribed zone was 585 ha, with a buffer zone of 11,470 ha. The buffer zone was formed by desert landscape, other saltpetre works, tailing cakes, exploited saltpetre pampas and railway network, among others. Its objective was to maintain their environmental and historic values as well as the landscape and the views associated with the property. Its legal protection and regulation was thought to be carried out through the inclusion of the area in the Municipal Zoning Plan of Pozo Almonte (Housing and Urban Development Law). Finally, the non-feasibility for this legal protection was determined, given that, in Chile, Communal Regulatory Plans do not include rural areas, which is the situation in which the site and its surroundings are located, and the territorial planning instruments that consider rural areas are larger scale.

In 2011, the State Party submitted a request for a minor modification to the boundaries of the property to allow the re-routed A-16 Road to be excluded from the boundary. Since the Route A-16 would then run down and parallel to the south boundary, it was considered logical to move this boundary slightly upwards, so as to leave the Route A-16 outside the property. The nominated area has been slightly reduced from 647.28 ha down to 573.48 ha. The request was approved by Decision 35 COM 8B.58. While approving the requested minor boundary modification, the World Heritage Committee recommended that the State Party provide a map showing the revised boundary and the buffer zone.

Since the property is inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, it has been, from 2005 onwards, the subject of yearly assessment by the World Heritage Committee. By Decision 37 COM 7A.37 (2013), the World Heritage Committee adopted the Desired State of Conservation and the corrective measures to remove the property from the Danger List. As for the buffer zone, the Committee requested that it be fully established and approved and regulatory measures for its protection be adopted and enforced. The indicators to verify that that request has been accomplished are an adopted buffer zone map, integrated with local and regional planning instruments; and the definition and implementation of regulatory measures for the proposed buffer zone.

In the report on the state of conservation of the property submitted in February 2018, the State Party informed that, during 2017, a proposed buffer zone had been established and work was carried out for its legal protection as a Typical Zone, being approved by the National Monuments Council on January 2018 and that, during 2018, works would be made to establish rules to regulate interventions in that territory.
By Decision 42 COM 7A.9 (2018), the World Heritage Committee welcomed the solution found for the protection of the proposed buffer zone and the declaration of this zone as a National Monument under the category of Typical Zone; requested the State Party to establish the regulatory measures for its management and protection and to submit the buffer zone as a formal Minor Boundary Modification application, as per Paragraph 163 and 164 of the Operational Guidelines, to the World Centre for evaluation by the Advisory Bodies and consideration by the World Heritage Committee.

Modification
This request for a minor boundary modification is a response to Decision 42 COM 7A.9 of the World Heritage Committee. The State Party proposes reducing the original buffer zone delineation to 1,826.39 ha; the reduction is justified by the State Party on the grounds that a smaller buffer zone fulfills the function of protecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, as it contains attributes related to environmental, historical and landscape values linked to the productive process of the saltpetre industry, and also protects visual cones from and to the saltpetre works.

The State Party acknowledges that it was not possible to protect, regulate and manage the buffer zone proposed at the time of inscription, since some sectors have been the subject of incompatible activities with heritage protection for several decades, among them mining production processes (iodine), transit activities and military training.

The proposed buffer zone contains attributes related to the significance of the property, among them the vestiges of 3 saltpetre works, with their respective tailing cakes, settlements with the first saltpetre processing systems, housing settlement associated with saltpetre exploitation. These vestiges help to better understand the complex urban and industrial saltpetre system and its insertion in the territory.

The proposed buffer zone is legally protected under the designation of Typical Zone "Surroundings of the Santiago Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpetre Works", in the framework of the Law 17,288 of National Monuments and Regulation of Typical Zones. The designation was approved by the Council of National Monuments in January 2018, through the Official Decree issued on 28 August 2018. The designation of Typical Zone is intended to protect the environmental and specific character of areas where archaeological sites or buildings designated Historic Monuments are located.

Any intervention in the buffer zone must be approved by the Council of National Monuments, which gives the State Party the possibility of control and supervision of this area. During 2018, the rules of intervention for the Typical Zone were elaborated and approved at the Council’s session on 31 January 2019. These rules include general criteria for the interventions within the buffer zone and specific guidelines for each of the types of interventions that have been identified. In the case of necessity of construction of new buildings or structures within the buffer zone, specific rules have been defined, so that they do not have a negative impact on the landscape features of the area. Should it be a breach of the permits granted or an unauthorized work, the Site Administrator has to inform the Council so that, jointly, the effective protection of the World Heritage Site is achieved.

Most of the area proposed as buffer zone is under the administration and management of the Museo del Salitre Corporation, founded in 1999 by pampinos. The Corporation has permanent staff on the site and, among other actions, it has provided security and obtained resources to intervene buildings that were structurally damaged or for large-scale interventions, such as water networks to stop fires.

The northern area and part of the western area of the buffer zone is granted to the Army of Chile, who agreed to the protection of this area. The Army carries out periodic monitoring in the area to avoid the alteration of the works located in this sector and has installed signage for heritage protection, restricting any type of military activity in it. In addition, they are in permanent contact with the Museo del Salitre Corporation and collaborate in different activities.

ICOMOS considers that, although the minor boundary modification implies a significant reduction of the buffer zone proposed at the time of the inscription on the World Heritage List, the present proposal represents a more realistic approach, since it has been adequately protected through the designation of Typical Zone and a set of rules have been adopted and implemented to ensure its effective role. The proposed buffer zone includes all the elements required to support the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and to understand the whole territory as a productive cultural landscape devoted to the mining of saltpetre. Adequate maps have also been provided by the State Party.

3 ICOMOS Recommendations

Recommendation with respect to inscription
ICOMOS recommends that the proposed creation of a buffer zone for Humberstone and Santa Laura Salpeter Works, Chile, be approved.
Map showing the revised boundaries of the buffer zone
City of Potosí  
(Plurinational State of Bolivia)  
No 420bis

1 Basic data

State Party  
Plurinational State of Bolivia

Name of property  
City of Potosi

Location  
Potosi, Province of Potosi

Inscription  
1987

Brief description  
In the 16th century, this area was regarded as the world’s largest industrial complex. The extraction of silver ore relied on a series of hydraulic mills. The site consists of the industrial monuments of the Cerro Rico, where water is provided by an intricate system of aqueducts and artificial lakes; the colonial town with the Casa de la Moneda; the Church of San Lorenzo; several patrician houses; and the barrios mitayos, the areas where the workers lived.

Date of ICOMOS approval of this report  
13 March 2019

2 Issues raised

Background  
In 1987, the City of Potosí (C 420) was inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi). The map supplied at the moment of inscription outlines the property but does not define a buffer zone.

The collapse of a portion of the summit of Cerro Rico in February 2011 ultimately led to the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2014 (38 COM 7B.38). In the wake of the collapse several pending issues concerning the site were considered in 2011, and the World Heritage Committee requested the development of a participatory Management Plan for the property and the official submission of a buffer zone (35 COM 7B.120). In 2014 the World Heritage Committee repeated the request to finalize the boundary clarification, within the framework of the Retrospective Inventory, and invited the State Party to submit a minor boundary modification “to allow for a clear understanding for the protection of the visually sensitive areas around the property” (38 COM 7B.38). The request was repeated in the following years on various occasions. In 2016, the World Heritage Committee furthermore mentioned the need to include in this process “the elaboration of land use regulation for the property and its surrounding areas in order to define a buffer zone to protect the visually sensitive areas around the property” (40 COM 7A.1).

The clarification of the limits of the property and a final proposal of the buffer zone are part of item d) on the list of Desired Corrective Measures for the Removal (DSOCR) of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, as well as part of the list of indicators defined to reflect each of the four corrective measures aimed at achieving the DSOCR, both approved by the World Heritage Committee in 2017.

Technical assistance provided by the World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS technical mission (May 2017) and the participatory workshop for the revision of the Draft Management Plan (May 2018), which was attended by experts, as well as local and national authorities, helped generate a final document for the clarification of the limits of the World Heritage property and definition of the buffer zone.

Modification  
The State Party submitted the Minor Boundary Modification document in January 2019, with several maps and tables of geographical coordinates as annexes. The document mentions that the property area is defined and georeferenced, and has a total area of 2210.93 ha. The annexes of the document contain a “Table of Geographical coordinates of the Core Zone” (Annex 2.1) and a “Table of Geographical coordinates Buffer Zone” (Annex 2.2). In section 2.2 Modification Description of the document, the State Party defines the buffer zone by using descriptions of the four sections of the property and its surrounding; the Historic Centre and the “Ríbera de los Ingenios” of Potosí City, Cerro Rico, Kari Kari Lagoons and the Area of Environmental Influence of the Qari Qari Lagoons. However, the description only mentions that parts of these sections are located in the buffer zone, without giving any detailed descriptions of the extent of the buffer zone in its totality, nor the reasons why the described sectors are divided in property area and buffer zone. In the next section, 2.3 Justification of the modification, more information is supplied concerning the extent of the buffer zone (e.g. “100 meters ... on each side of the axis of the river”, “the two main basins that feed the lagoons with water”), and the area of Environmental Influence of the Kari Kari Lagoons is defined as an area “that maintains a close social, economic and ecological interaction with the property”. No further details are provided. The final sections of the document do not supply any further information on the exact extent of the buffer zone, the reasons for the chosen limits, or details of any special regulations / legislation applicable in the buffer zone. No reference is made to the land use regulation and the protection of the visually sensitive areas around the
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property, as mentioned in the actions requested by the World Heritage Committee (referred to above).

3 ICOMOS Recommendations

Recommendation with respect to inscription
ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the proposed minor modification to the boundary, and the proposed buffer zone of the City of Potosí, Plurinational State of Bolivia, be referred back to the State Party in order to allow it to:

- Elaborate a clear description of:
  a. the limits of the property and any possible differences from the map included in the nomination dossier,
  b. the limits of the buffer zone,
  c. and the limits of the area of environmental influence,

- Clarify the rationale for the delineation of these boundaries, by taking into account the protection of the visually sensitive areas around the property, as mentioned by the Decision 38 COM 7B.38 of the World Heritage Committee,

- Provide explicit information on the legal and management aspects, such as land use regulations, that are applied in the regulation of the two newly defined buffer zone and area of environmental influence,

- Provide detailed explanations on the different regulations applicable in areas which are already in place and overlapping with the buffer zone (such as Intensive Protection Area of the Historical Center, the Historic Center Transition Area, the Protected Area of the Ribera de los Ingenios, and the Cerro Rico Protection Area). Also describe which regulations take precedence,

- Consider the possibility to homogenize the limits of the different zones, in order to reduce overlap;
Map showing the revised boundaries of the property and of the buffer zone
**Maya Site of Copan**  
**Honduras**  
**No 129bis**

### 1 Basic data

**State Party**  
Honduras

**Name of property**  
Maya Site of Copan

**Location**  
Copan Ruinas, Department of Copan

**Inscription**  
1980

**Brief description**  
Discovered in 1570 by Diego García de Palacio, the ruins of Copan, one of the most important sites of the Mayan civilization, were not excavated until the 19th century. The ruined citadel and imposing public squares reveal the three main stages of development before the city was abandoned in the early 10th century.

**Date of ICOMOS approval of this report**  
13 March 2019

### 2 Issues raised

**Background**
At the time of inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, no precise limits of the property and no buffer zone were defined. In the framework of the retrospective inventory, the World Heritage Committee urged the State Party to officially submit the limits of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone (33 COM 7B.137, Seville, 2009). The information presented by the State Party in response to this request was considered incomplete and unclear by ICOMOS. Following a new submission, the boundary of the World Heritage property was approved by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session (Krakow, 2017).

A buffer zone, larger than the one under review in this present report, had been proposed in the Management Plan 2014-2020 but was not approved by the *Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia (IHAH)* and the stakeholders, for several reasons, especially because (1) it was considered to be too extended on the northeast side to effectively implement legal restrictions, and (2) had led to land speculations as the State had expressed its willingness to buy land included in the buffer zone.

**Modification**

The current buffer zone proposal is of 258.365 ha and is similar in general terms to the previous one, but has reduced its size at the northeast and southeast (south of the river).

The buffer zone is described as having an "exclusive zone" (gathering areas 1 and 2, the latter being the extension of the Archaeological Park, marked in green on the map), where only positive changes for investigation, heritage protection and visitor safety are accepted. The only area where more flexibility in the activities is permitted is the location of the public facilities, in the north western part of area 1. The second zone, called "zone of restricted activities" (gathering areas 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8), only allows low impact activities (agriculture and pasture). Other low impact changes will be allowed, as described by the State Party, "if they are to satisfy a social or economic necessity without alternative, in which case a strict impact assessment will be undertaken, and its recommendations implemented". The areas 1 to 8 are having different ownership and land-use statuses. Areas 1 and 5 are state owned, the other areas are private property.

With reference to the Management Plan, the State Party describes four regulation zones: The World Heritage Property (zone 0), and the buffer zone (zone 1), the area of influence, located around the buffer zone (zone 2) and the rest of the Copan pocket (zone 3). Beyond the buffer zone, the State Party describes the "area of influence" (zone 2), which as having "its own restrictions albeit less strict than those of the buffer zone". Within this area of influence, the Management Plan has created eleven "protected enclaves" (*recintos protegidos*), which mark an area around a monument (for example, a stele or an altar), in order for it to receive the same kind of protections as the elements in the buffer zone. In the area of influence, "any change must be authorized by the IHAH after a heritage impact assessment, with a particular attention to registered archaeological remains and "visual" impacts". In the rest of the Copan area "any change must also be authorized by the IHAH after a survey with a particular attention to unregistered archaeological remains". As on previous occasions, the State Party expressed its intent to buy the areas of the buffer zone that are not already in possession of the State.

The documentation submitted shows clearly the buffer zone proposal. The proposed buffer zone seems adequate and includes the "immediate setting of the nominated property, important views and other areas or attributes that are functionally important as a support to the property and its protection" as required by the Operational Guidelines. Especially, the protection of the site from urban pressure exerted by the Copan Ruinas village, located to the west of the site, seems to be well considered.

However, ICOMOS notes that the map of the proposed buffer zone delineation does not include the area of influence, nor the location of the eleven protected enclaves. In addition, the legends of the map could be
completed as it does not explain the green areas (Archaeological Park), nor the orange rectangles (modern buildings).

The State of Conservation Report conducted by the State Party summarizes the legal protection of the property as being guaranteed by the Constitution (1982: article 172), the Law for the Protection of Cultural Heritage (1997), and the Presidential Resolution 185 of 1982 declaring National Monument “all the archaeological vestiges of the geographical zone known as the Copan Valley ..., including the pre-Hispanic city of Copan...” However, ICOMOS considers that it is unclear what exactly the legislation protects and how the regulations will be enforced by the creation of the buffer zone, especially before the State Party acquired all the areas of the buffer zone not yet in its possession.

3 ICOMOS Recommendations

Recommendation with respect to inscription
ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the proposed buffer zone for the Maya Site of Copan, Honduras, be referred back to the State Party in order to allow it to:

- Complete the map showing the proposed buffer zone with a comprehensive legend and the localisation of the area of influence and the eleven protective enclaves,

- Provide more detailed information on the legislation regulating the property, the buffer zone and the area of influence,

- Specify how the regulation of the buffer zone will be enforced and how and when an agreement with all the landowners will be reached;
Map showing the proposed buffer zone