

## 1. World Heritage Property Data

### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Garrison Border Town of Elvas and its Fortifications

### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

#### State(s) Party(ies)

- Portugal

#### Type of Property

cultural

#### Identification Number

1367bis



#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2012

### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Garrison Border Town of Elvas and its Fortifications	38.881 / -7.163	179.356	690	869.356	2012
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>179.356</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>869.356</b>	

### 1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Garrison Border Town of Elvas and its Fortifications - Inscribed Property	06/07/2012	
Map of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone	02/07/2013	

### 1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Luís Pinho Lopes  
Direção-Geral do Património Cultural  
Architecte

#### Comment

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

### 1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Elsa Grilo  
Elvas City Council (Câmara Municipal de Elvas)  
Councillor

#### Comment

Deputy Mayor

### 1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

#### Comment

1) Elvas City Council - www.cm-elvas.pt 2) Directorate General for Cultural Heritage - www.patrimoniocultural.pt 3) Portuguese Commission for UNESCO -

www.unescoportugal.mne.pt/ 4) Information System for Cultural Heritage - www.monumentos.pt

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

#### Comment

European Cultural Convention (1976); Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (1991); Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (2005)

## 2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

### 2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

#### Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

##### Brief synthesis

Guarding the key border crossing between Portugal's capital Lisbon and Spain's capital Madrid, in an undulating, riverine landscape, the Garrison Town of Elvas was fortified extensively from the 17th to the 19th centuries to become the largest bulwarked dry ditch system in the world, with outlying forts built on surrounding hills to accommodate the changing needs of defensive warfare.

The town was supplied with water by the 7km-long Amoreira Aqueduct, built in the late 16th and early 17th centuries and a key feature enabling the stronghold to withstand a lengthy siege. Within the walls, the town contains extensive barracks and other military buildings, as well as churches and monasteries, some adapted to military functions. The property includes seven components: the Historic Centre, the Amoreira Aqueduct, the Fort of Santa Luzia, and the covered way linking it to the Historic Centre, the Fort of Graça, and the Fortlets of São Mamede, São Pedro and São Domingos. The historic centre with its castle, remnant walls and civil and religious buildings demonstrate the development of Elvas as three successive walled towns from the 10th to the 14th century and its subsequent incorporation into the major fortification works of the Portuguese War of the Restoration period (1641-68), when a wide range of military buildings were built for its role as a garrison town.

The bulwarked fortifications of the town and the outlying Fort of Santa Luzia and Graça and fortlets of São Mamede, São Pedro and São Domingos reflect the evolution of the Dutch system of fortification into an outstanding dry-ditch defence system.

These surviving fortifications were begun in 1643 and comprise twelve forts inserted in an irregular polygon, roughly centred on the castle and making use of a landscape of hills. The bulwarks are battered, surrounded by a dry ditch and counterscarp and further protected by a number of ravelins. The fortifications were designed by the Dutch Jesuit Cosmader, based on the treaties of fortification engineer Samuel Marolois, whose work together with that of Simon Stevin and Adam Fritach launched the Dutch school of fortification worldwide. Cosmader applied the geometric theory of Marolois to the irregular topography of Elvas, to produce a defensive system considered a masterpiece of its time.

In the 18th century the Fort of Graça was constructed in response to the development of longer-range artillery, as well as four fortlets to the west.

As the remains of an enormous war fortress, Elvas is exceptional as a military landscape with visual and functional relationships between its fortifications, representing

developments in military architecture and technology drawn from Dutch, Italian, French and English military theory and practice. Elvas is an outstanding demonstration of Portugal's desire for land and autonomy, and the universal aspirations of European nation States in the 16th-17th centuries.

**Criterion (iv)** : Elvas is an outstanding example of a garrison town and its dry-ditched bulwarked defence system, which developed in response to disruptions in the balance of power within 17th century Europe. Elvas can thus be seen as representing the universal aspirations of European nation States in the 16th-17th centuries for autonomy and land.

#### **Integrity**

All elements necessary to express the Outstanding Universal Value of the property are included within the property boundary. A number of buildings are unoccupied and are closed up against squatters and vandalism, and are subject to encroachment by vegetation. In particular the Fort of Graça, being relatively isolated and unused is vulnerable to vandalism. Views of the fortifications from a distance and between each other are vulnerable to new development and the visual integrity of the property needs to be protected by a slightly enlarged buffer zone with adequate controls.

#### **Authenticity**

The large collection of original plans and drawings, military reports, photographs and descriptions testify to the authenticity of the property. Overall, the form and materials of the fortifications are still in virtually the same state as when they were rendered obsolete in the 19th century. The military and religious buildings have largely retained their function or another appropriate use until the present. The authenticity of the setting is impacted by large communication masts and is vulnerable to new development.

#### **Protection and management requirements**

The property will be declared a National Monument subject to the National Law No. 107/2001 on Cultural Heritage by the end of 2012. The buffer zone will be declared a Special Protection Area subject to controls in the Municipal Master Plan by the end of 2012. This whole area including the property will then be managed by the Municipality with input from the Ministry of Culture through IGESPAR.

There is a need to slightly enlarge the buffer zone to protect the views between the Fortlet of São Domingo and the Fort of Graça.

The Integrated Management Plan for the Fortifications of Elvas (IMPFE) aims to bring all stakeholders together to ensure the integrity of the property and enhance its potential use. It aims to control the buffer zone area as well as the area of the property, focusing on institutional cooperation, involvement of private stakeholders, educational, scientific and cultural initiatives and dissemination of information. The Management Plan will be implemented by the Office for the Fortifications of Elvas within the city of Elvas, once this is appointed by the Mayor.

In order to underpin the Plan there is a need to establish a full inventory of the features and structures as a basis for management and monitoring. There is also a need for the preparation of guidance on appropriate design for new and infill buildings.

#### **Comment**

There has been an extension of the buffer zone to protect the views between the Fortlet of São Domingo and the Fort of Graça. This action has already been communicated to the World Heritage Committee.

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

(iv)

## **2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion**

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

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

## **3. Factors Affecting the Property**

### **3.14. Other factor(s)**

#### **3.14.1 - Other factor(s)**

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact				Origin	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>						
3.1.1	Housing						
3.1.2	Commercial development						
3.1.3	Industrial areas						
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure						
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities						
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>						
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure						
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure						
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>						
3.3.1	Water infrastructure						
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities						
3.3.4	Localised utilities						
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>						
3.4.2	Ground water pollution						
3.4.5	Solid waste						
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>						
3.5.1	Fishing/collecting aquatic resources						
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals						
3.5.5	Crop production						
3.5.6	Commercial wild plant collection						
3.5.7	Subsistence wild plant collection						
3.5.8	Commercial hunting						
3.5.9	Subsistence hunting						
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production						
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>						
3.7.2	Relative humidity						
3.7.3	Temperature						
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>						
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses						
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage						
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community						
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>						
3.10.6	Temperature change						
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>						
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)						
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>						
3.13.3	Management activities						
<b>Legend</b>	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
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.2	Relative humidity	localised	frequent	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.7.3	Temperature	localised	frequent	minor	medium capacity	static
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	static

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

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

## 4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

### 4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

#### 4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 4.2. Protective Measures

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

The legal status and protection measures that are in force in the Fortifications of Elvas and its surrounding area, cumulatively covering the whole territory considered in the Surrounding Integrated Conservation Area – SICA, define a framework of constraints on the activities of private stakeholders, with the aim of protecting the integrity of the existing cultural heritage and natural assets. The measures are not specific to this area, but reflect the local variety of the assets which enjoy protection regimes arising from national policies. The protection is established by State, and is based on the recognition of a collective interest, imposing a set of obligations on the stakeholders, as well as restrictions on the right of ownership.

The process of implementing these measures involves the intervention both of the bodies involved that manage the

protection measures of the cultural heritage and natural assets on which we are focusing here, which are outside the remit of local management, in particular, IGESPAR, RDELPA and ARDA, as well as that of the City of Elvas Council (CEC), which is the managing body of the territory *par excellence*. In some specific local development initiatives, as in the case of tourism, other external bodies intervene in the process of land management, namely the Committee for the Coordination and Regional Development of Alentejo (CCRDA) and Tourism Portugal, I.P. (TP).

#### Comment

IGESPAR has been replaced by the Directorate General for Cultural Heritage (DGPC)

#### 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 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

#### 4.2.4 - 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

The objectives, strategy and organisation that guide the Management Plan follows the principles of "integrated conservation", widely accepted in the doctrine and practice of built heritage, as well as the "Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention".


The operating concept which the model of action proposed in this IMPFE (Integrated Management Plan for the Fortifications of Elvas) is based on is that of "integrated conservation", to be understood as the result of the joint, integrated, and

appropriate application of the principles of conserving heritage, in today's society and in urban and regional planning.

Three main areas of action should be privileged:

- i. selective and exemplary interventions of built heritage of the Fortifications of Elvas, in defence of its integrity and enhancing its potential use;
- ii. control of transformation and of the environmental and infrastructural adaptation of its close surroundings, with emphasis on the intramural area, in the sense of strengthening the consistency and continuity of the enjoyment of the heritage complex and to promote conditions for its harmonious and balanced integration into urban process;
- iii. action on "intangible" elements, with an emphasis on organisational issues, institutional cooperation, involvement of private stakeholders, educational, scientific and cultural initiatives and dissemination of information.

**4.3.2 - Management Documents**

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Management Plan of Garrison Border Town of Elvas and its Fortifications	N/A	Available	20/12/2010	

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

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

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

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

**4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?**

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

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

An annual work / action plan exists and **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	Poor
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Fair
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 **directly contribute** to some decisions relating to management

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

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

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

There is **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)	0%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	30%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	70%
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?**

There is **no budget** for effective management of the World Heritage property despite an identified need

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

Existing sources of funding are **not secure**

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

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

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

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

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

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

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

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

Full-time	70%
Part-time	30%

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

Permanent	70%
Seasonal	30%

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

Paid	80%
Volunteer	20%

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

Human resources are **adequate** for management needs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**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** for most key areas **but there are gaps**

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

There is a **small amount** of research, but it is not planned

**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**

Bucho, Domingos - Systems and Schools of Bulwarked Fortification adopted in Elvas, Edições Colibri, 2010. Elvas Caia, Internacional Scientific Revue, CME

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

The Municipality of Elvas, the Extremadura University and the Portalegre Institute are responsible for the implementation of postgraduate studies concerning the conservation of cultural heritage. The studies began last October (2013) in Elvas and will end in July 2014.

**4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building**

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

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

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

Local communities / residents	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Excellent
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Excellent

Visitors	Excellent
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Excellent

**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 education and awareness programme but it only **partly meets the needs** and could be improved

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**4.7. Visitor Management**

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

Last year	Major Increase (100%+)
Two years ago	Major Increase (100%+)
Three years ago	Minor Increase
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
Accommodation establishments

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property**

**which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**4.8. Monitoring**

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

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

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

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient and key indicators have been defined but **monitoring the status of indicators could be improved**

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

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Excellent
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Non-existent
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?**

Implementation is **underway**

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

According to the Legal Order 14801/2013, 15/11/2013, from the Minister of Defense, The Fort of Graça was transferred to the Municipality of Elvas. The recovery and conservation project has already been drafted and the international public tender is in progress. Works will begin next summer (2014).



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
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>					
<b>3.7.2</b>	<b>Relative humidity</b>	Criteria IV- it affects the buildings	Control of humidity values.	Use of equipment to measure humidity values.	Throughout the year to identify and analyse any variations.	Municipality of Elvas Control of this factor in the old buildings is not an easy task.
<b>3.7.3</b>	<b>Temperature</b>	Criteria IV- it affects the buildings	Control of temperature values.	Use of equipment to measure temperature values.	Throughout the year to identify and analyse any variations.	Municipality of Elvas Control of this factor in the old buildings is not an easy task.
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>					
<b>3.11.6</b>	<b>Fire (wildfires)</b>	Criteria IV- it affects the buildings	The Municipality of Elvas developed a civil protection plan.	The Municipality has a monitoring team exclusively for this operation,	During spring and summer essentially.	Municipality of Elvas Most of the fires are due to high temperatures during the summer.

### 5.2. Summary - Management Needs

#### 5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

<b>4.3 Management System / Management Plan</b>						
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
<b>4.3.10</b>	<b>There is little or no contact with industry regarding management</b>	The Municipality of Elvas intends to reinforce contacts with industry agents, either at a local, national or international scale.	During 2014-2017	Municipality of Elvas and local infrastructures and equipemnt	The Municipality of Elvas intends to prepare a management plan	
<b>4.4 Financial and Human Resources</b>						
<b>4.4.3</b>	<b>There is no budget for effective management</b>	Candidacy to european funds.	During 2014-2017	Municipality of Elvas	The investment on Wold heritage management depends on the annual Municipality's budget. The Municipality will continue to invest. European funds are also extremly important.	
<b>4.4.4</b>	<b>Existing sources of funding are not secure</b>	Preparation of projects for candidacy programmes.	During 2014-2017	Municipality of Elvas.	European funds have helped in the implementation of many management actions well, but this has only been possible because the municipality ensures a value of reimbursement.	
<b>4.5 Scientific Studies and Research Projects</b>						
<b>4.5.2</b>	<b>Research in the property is not planned</b>	Implementation of the Heritge School of Elvas. Continuation of the project of the postgraduate course in Heritage Restoration, which develops in Elvas since last October 2013.	During 2014-2017	Municipality of Elvas, Universities.	The implentation of the School and the Couse aims to contribute to improve a higher and a long time awareness towards world heritage.	

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

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

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

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

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

yes

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

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

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Good
Advisory Body	Good

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

**Most** of the required information was accessible

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

Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

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

UNESCO	Excellent
State Party	Excellent
Site Managers	Excellent
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: There has been an extension of the buffer zone to protect the views between the Fortlet of São Domingo and the Fort of Graça. This action has already been communicated to the World Heritage Committee.

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