

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Church and Dominican Convent of Santa Maria delle Grazie with "The Last Supper" by Leonardo da Vinci

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Italy

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

93

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Church and Dominican Convent of Santa Maria delle Grazie with "The Last Supper" by Leonardo da Vinci	45.466 / 9.171	1.5	0	1.5	1980
Total (ha)		1.5	0	1.5	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Aerial photograph fo Church and Dominican Convent of Santa Maria delle Grazie	27/06/2005	
Localizzazione complesso di S. Maria delle Grazie, scale 1:5,069	27/06/2005	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Adele Cesi
Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali
Funzionario
Ufficio Patrimonio Mondiale UNESCO, Segretariato Generale - Servizio 1

Comment

Ministero dei Beni e delle Attività Culturali e del Turismo
Francesca Riccio Funzionario Ufficio Patrimonio Mondiale UNESCO, Segretariato Generale - Servizio 1 Via del Collegio Romano, 27 00186 Roma Italy Telephone: +39 06 67232140 Fax: +39 06 67232105 Email: francesca.riccio@beniculturali.it

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Giuseppe Napoleone
Superintendence for architectural heritage and landscape of Milan - MIBAC
Direttore del Museo del Cenacolo Vinciano

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)

Comment

www.cenacolovinciano.org (information and booking)
www.lombardia.beniculturali.it (for general informations)

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

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Comment

The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been revised in compliance with the new format, based on the Decision 34 COM 10B.3 of the World Heritage Committee in 2007. It is currently subject to the evaluation of Advisory Bodies

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

(i)(ii)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

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

The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been revised in compliance with the new format, based on the Decision 34 COM 10B.3 of the World Heritage Committee in 2007. It is currently subject to the evaluation of Advisory Bodies

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

3. Factors Affecting the Property

3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact				Origin
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure					
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.4	Air pollution					
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.5	Dust					
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses					
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage					
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation					
3.13	Management and institutional factors					
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities					
3.13.3	Management activities					
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.4	Air pollution	widespread	on-going	significant	medium capacity	decreasing
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.5	Dust	widespread	on-going	significant	medium capacity	static

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

3.17.1 - Comments

In 2012 a congestion charge has been established for the whole Milan's city centre with a 30% reduction of vehicular traffic nearby the site. Moreover the main street in front of the church became a one way road

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is no buffer zone, but there is a need for one

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

The boundaries of the World Heritage property **do not limit** the ability to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value but they could be improved

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.2. Protective Measures

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

The complex is the subject of a preservation order ("vincolo") first made in 1912 under legislation concerning the artistic patrimony. Subsequently (1953), an area of respect around the church was made the subject of an order which limits construction and the modification of building facades nearby. Most recently, an order was made limiting the car park in the piazza opposite the church front (1987).

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Sunday, November 27, 2005

• Question 6.02

The complex is the subject of a preservation order ("vincolo") first made in 1912 under legislation concerning the artistic patrimony.

Subsequently (1953), an area of respect around the church was made the subject of an order which limits construction and the modification of building facades nearby.

Most recently, an order was made limiting the car park in the piazza opposite the church front (1987).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

A formally constituted steering group has been set up to guide the management of the site in January 2003. The scientific and technical pilot committee constituted within the West Lombardy Soprintendenza for Architectural Heritage and Landscape coordinates work aimed at the protection and preservation of the site, as part of its wider responsibilities as authority charged with safeguarding the cultural patrimony. The committee has the task of defining the guidelines, procedures, programming and periodic monitoring applied to the protection system, which has been established in particular for The Last Supper, and of guaranteeing efficient interaction with the conservation and maintenance programmes for the entire building complex.

The levels of public authority who are primarily involved with the management of the site are national and local. The complex is state property and, apart from the Last Supper, is given in concession to the Dominican Fathers of Santa Maria delle Grazie, who contribute to the day-to-day administration of the complex with regard to its residential and religious functions.

Aspects concerning conservation, surveillance and protection are directly managed by the Ministry for Cultural Heritage and Activities through the Soprintendenza for Architectural Heritage and Landscape, and other additional services are contracted out in accordance with pertinent national legislation.

The Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities, Lombardy Regional Directorate for Cultural and Landscape Heritage is responsible for over-seeing the implementation of the management plan and monitoring its effectiveness.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Sunday, November 27, 2005

• Question 5.02

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

• Question 5.03

Set up date: 2003

Function: The scientific and technical pilot committee constituted within the West Lombardy Soprintendenza for Architectural Heritage and Landscape coordinates work aimed at the protection and preservation of the site, as part of its wider responsibilities as authority charged with safeguarding the cultural patrimony

Mandate: The committee has the task of defining the guidelines, procedures, programming and periodic monitoring applied to the protection system, which has been established in particular for The Last Supper, and of guaranteeing efficient interaction with the conservation and maintenance programmes for the entire building complex

Constituted: formal

• Question 5.05

Overall management system of the site

- Management by the State Party
- Management under protective legislation
- Other effective management system

The site is state property and given in concession to the Dominican Fathers, who contribute to the day-to-day administration of the complex with regard to its residential and religious functions.

Aspects concerning conservation, surveillance and protection are directly managed by the Ministry for Cultural Heritage and Activities through the Soprintendenza for Architectural Heritage and Landscape, and other additional services are contracted out in accordance with pertinent national legislation.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

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

There is **excellent coordination** between all bodies / levels involved in the management of the property

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

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

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

The management system is being **fully** implemented and monitored

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

An annual work / action plan exists and **many activities** are being implemented

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

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

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

Local communities have **no input** into decisions relating to the management

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

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

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

There is **little or no contact** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

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

4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World

Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report

4.4. Financial and Human Resources

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

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	100%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	0%

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

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

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

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

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

Full-time	90%
Part-time	10%

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

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	

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

Paid	100%
Volunteer	

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

Human resources are **adequate** for management needs

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

Research and monitoring	Good
Promotion	Good
Community outreach	Poor
Interpretation	Poor
Education	Good
Visitor management	Good
Conservation	Good
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Not applicable
Tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

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

Research and monitoring	Low
Promotion	Low
Community outreach	Not applicable
Interpretation	Not applicable
Education	Not available
Visitor management	Low
Conservation	Low
Administration	Low
Risk preparedness	Not applicable
Tourism	Low
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Low

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

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

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

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

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

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

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

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

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

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

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

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

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

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

In **one location and easily visible** to visitors

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

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

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

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

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

World Heritage status has been an **important influence** on education, information and awareness building activities

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

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

4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following

visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

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

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

4.7. Visitor Management

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

Last year	Minor Increase
Two years ago	Static
Three years ago	Static
Four years ago	Static
Five years ago	Static

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

Entry tickets and registries
Visitor surveys

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

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

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is **effectively managed** and does not impact its Outstanding Universal Value

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

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

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

The fee is collected and makes a **substantial contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

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

a Minor increase since 2013 is due to the improvement of visitor's access limit (from 25 to 30 visitors each 15 minute). entry fees go to the central government not directly to the site

4.8. Monitoring

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No relevant Committee recommendations to implement

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

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

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

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

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.4	Pollution						
3.4.4	Air pollution	all	the Milan Council established in 212 a concession charge in the city centre that reduced the vehicular traffic about 30%- The square in front of the church became definitively a pedestrian area.	Formal monitoring programme	2008/2015	Lombardy Regional Directorate for Cultural and Landscape and the West Lombardy Superintendence for Architectural Heritage and Landscape. Council of Milan	the situation is almost the same of first periodic report
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
3.7.5	Dust	all	the danger is at present controlled by regulating the quantity of visitors and the duration of their presence in the refectory by limiting access to groups of 30 persons for for 15 minutes and the creation of a waiting room for	Formal monitoring programme	2008/2015	Lombardy Regional Directorate for Cultural and Landscape and the West Lombardy Superintendence for Architectural Heritage and Landscape. West Lombardy Soprintendenza for Architectural Heritage and Landscape Piazza Duomo 14 20121 Milan	the situation is the same of first periodic report

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones							
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.1.1	There is a need for a buffer zone	The site corresponds exactly to the extension of the building complex constituted by the same church and convent but the square in front of the church has been close to traffic and many regulations to reduce vehicular traffic were improved	2008	Lombardy Regional Directorate for Cultural and Landscape and the West Lombardy Superintendence for Architectural Heritage and Landscape Council of Milan	-		
4.1.2	Boundaries could be improved	the square in front of the church has been close to traffic and many regulations to reduce vehicular traffic were improved	2008	Lombardy Regional Directorate for Cultural and Landscape and the West Lombardy Superintendence for Architectural Heritage and Landscape Council of Milan	-		
4.3 Management System / Management Plan							
4.3.8	Local communities have no input into management decisions	local communities appreciate the world heritage visiting it and considering it a "must see" in Milan but they are not involved in management	on going	Lombardy Regional Directorate for Cultural and Landscape and the West Lombardy Superintendence for Architectural Heritage and Landscape Council of Milan	no comment		
4.3.10	There is little or no contact with industry regarding management	industry different from tourist industry has no interest into site management	on going	Lombardy Regional Directorate for Cultural and Landscape and the West Lombardy Superintendence for Architectural Heritage and Landscape Council of Milan	no comment		

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

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

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

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

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

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

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

Other important cultural and / or natural values and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

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

5.4.1 - Comments

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

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

Conservation	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Not applicable
Funding for the property	Not applicable
International cooperation	Not applicable
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Not applicable
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	Very positive
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

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

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

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

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

yes

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

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

UNESCO	Very good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Poor

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

Most of the required information was accessible

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

The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

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

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	Satisfactory

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

• Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Reason for update: The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been revised in compliance with the new format, based on the Decision 34 COM 10B.3 of the World Heritage Committee in 2007. It is currently subject to the evaluation of Advisory Bodies

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