

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Roman Walls of Lugo

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Spain

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

987


Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2000

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Roman Walls of Lugo	43.011 / -7.553	1.68	59.88	61.56	2000
Total (ha)		1.68	59.88	61.56	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Roman Walls of Lugo map	02/12/2000	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Elisa de Cabo de la Vega
Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte
Subdirectora de Protección de Patrimonio Histórico
- Laura de Miguel Riera
Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte

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

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Manuel María Chaín Pérez
Dirección Xeral do Patrimonio Cultural da Xunta de Galicia
Subdirector Xeral de Conservación e restauración de bens Culturais

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

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

Comment

1. Web of the Interpretation Centre of the Walls (Municipality of Lugo):
http://www.lugoturismo.com/quevisitar/cultural/monumentos_detalle_popUp.asp?idMonumento=87
2. Web about the wall (Municipality of Lugo)
<http://www.lugoturismo.com/quevisitar/cultural/?idioma=c&pag>

=muralla. 3.Turgalicia: http://www.turgalicia.es/muralla-romana-lugo?langId=gl_ES

4. <http://www.mcu.es/patrimonio/MC/PatrimonioMundial/BienesDec/ListadoBienes/Lugo.html>

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 SOUV is currently under revision by the Advisory Bodies.

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

(iv)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Good state of conservation. It keeps the original design and materials (integrity). It keeps constructive elements for defense (towers, bastions, gates, steps, moat). The archaeological remains testify of its origins and evolution. Archaeology and historical documents confirm its authenticity. The walkway is totally usable; it is used by residents and visitors as a leisure space and urban life. Its presence has determined the urban planning since its beginnings.

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

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

3. Factors Affecting the Property

3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact						Origin
3.1	Buildings and Development							
3.1.1	Housing		⊖		🚧		🌱	
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities	⊕		🚧			🌱	
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure							
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure		⊖		🚧		🌱	
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure		⊖	🚧			🌱	
3.4	Pollution							
3.4.4	Air pollution		⊖		🚧		🌱	
3.5	Biological resource use/modification							
3.5.5	Crop production	⊕		🚧	🚧	🌱	🌱	
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric							
3.7.2	Relative humidity		⊖	🚧			🌱	
3.7.3	Temperature		⊖		🚧		🌱	
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)		⊖	🚧		🌱	🌱	
3.7.7	Pests		⊖	🚧	🚧	🌱	🌱	
3.7.8	Micro-organisms		⊖		🚧	🌱	🌱	
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	⊕		🚧	🚧	🌱	🌱	
3.9	Other human activities							
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage		⊖	🚧		🌱		
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events							
3.10.1	Storms		⊖		🚧		🌱	
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events							
3.11.2	Earthquake		⊖		🚧		🌱	
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species							
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species		⊖	🚧		🌱		
3.13	Management and institutional factors							
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities	⊕		🚧	🚧	🌱		
3.13.2	High impact research / monitoring activities	⊕			🚧	🌱		
3.13.3	Management activities	⊕		🚧	🚧	🌱	🌱	
Legend	🚧 Current	🚧 Potential	⊖ Negative	⊕ Positive	🌱 Inside	🌱 Outside		

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	restricted	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	decreasing
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.2	Relative humidity	widespread	on-going	insignificant	high capacity	static
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)	widespread	intermittent or sporadic	minor	high capacity	decreasing
3.7.7	Pests	extensive	intermittent or sporadic	minor	high capacity	decreasing
3.9	Other human activities					

		Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	extensive	intermittent or sporadic	minor	high 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 basic protection derives from the 1985 Spanish Heritage Law, under the provisions of which the Lugo Roman Walls have been declared to be a Property of Cultural Interest (Bien de Interés Cultural). This is reinforced by the 1995 Heritage Law of the Autonomous Community of Galicia. All interventions that may affect the condition or status of protected properties must be submitted to the relevant government agency for evaluation, and there are severe penalties for transgression.

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 **excellent** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property

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

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

Following a survey of ownership carried out in the late 1960s, ownership of the totality of the walls was vested in 1973 in the Spanish State, through the Ministry of Education and Science. It was transferred to the Xunta de Galicia by Royal Decree in 1994. The Spanish Constitution reserves certain rights in relation to the heritage to the central government. However, these are delegated to the competent agencies in the Autonomous Communities, in this case the Xunta de Galicia. For the Lugo walls the Xunta is in the position of both owner and competent agency. Under the Galician Heritage Law the Xunta is required to cooperate with the municipal authorities in ensuring the protection and conservation of listed monuments, and certain functions are delegated down to them. The Xunta operates through its General Directorate of Cultural Heritage (Dirección General de Patrimonio Cultural), based in Santiago de Compostela. The Master Plan for the Conservation and Restoration of the Roman Walls of Lugo (1992) covered proposals for actions to be taken in respect of research and techniques of restoration. This was followed in 1997 by the Special Plan for the Protection and Internal Reform of the Fortified Enceinte of the Town of Lugo, which is concerned principally with the urban environment of the historic town. However, it has a direct impact on the protection afforded to the walls, in terms of traffic planning, the creation of open spaces, and regulation of building heights. Another planning instrument which affects the walls is the Special Plan for the Protection of the Miño [river], approved by the

municipality at the beginning of 1998. There is at the present time no management plan *sensu stricto* for the walls in operation in Lugo: work is continuing on the basis of the 1992 plan. Nor is there a technical unit specifically responsible for the conservation and restoration of the walls. It is against this background that serious consideration is being given to the creation of an independent foundation, under royal patronage and with representatives from government, academic, voluntary, and business institutions, to work with the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage of Galicia. The work plan of this body would include the development and implementation of integrated conservation, restoration and maintenance programmes.

Comment

The General Directorate of Cultural Heritage of Galicia promotes and finances works for conservation and valuation of the site. Every year implements a plan for the pests control and biological colonies, correction of damages caused by atmospheric agents and damages caused by man. The regional government and the Municipality cooperate in management and tourism. Delete paragraph: "It is against...programmes"

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

1992 Integrated plan for conservation and restoration of the Roman walls of Lugo (being revised) 1997 Special Plan for the Protection and Internal Reform of the Fortified Enceinte of the Town of Lugo 1997 Special Plan for the Protection of the Miño river 2011 Plan General de Ordenación Municipal 2011-2014 Plan of maintenance of the Roman wall of Lugo

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 only **partially adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Local communities have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management

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

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

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

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

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

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

There have been no changes in the legal status because the Roman wall has the maximum protection level as a Good of Cultural Interes (BIC). Nevertheless, we can say that more efforts have been invested in investigation and conservation, there is Plan for maintenance every four years in order to prevent damages caused by negative factors that affect it and a follow-up is made of them, as well as the actions conducting to reduce them (treatments, restorations, etc).

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)	13%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	82%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	5%
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)

Comment

None.

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

The available budget is **sufficient** but further funding would enable more effective management to international best practice standard

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	0%
Part-time	100%

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

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	0%

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

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

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

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

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

Research and monitoring	Good
Promotion	Poor
Community outreach	Not applicable
Interpretation	Poor
Education	Non-existent
Visitor management	Non-existent
Conservation	Good
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Non-existent

Tourism	Fair
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Fair

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

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

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

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

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

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 **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

RODRÍGUEZ COLMENERO, A. / RODÁ DE LLANZA, I. (eds.),2007, Murallas de ciudades romanas en el occidente del imperio: Lvcvs Avgvsti como paradigma. Actas del Congreso Internacional (Lugo, 26-29.XI.2005); CAÑIZARES, A., INIESTO ALBA, M.J. 2011, " Estudio geométrico de deformaciones con apoyo de tecnología láser escáner. Aplicación a la muralla romana de Lugo". TOPOGRAFÍA Y CARTOGRAFÍA, vol.2, nº 162.

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

Until 2000: research of the University of Santiago regarding vegetable species, damages caused and more suitable treatments. The maintenance Plan (2011-2014) includes the application of the recommended treatments and a follow-up. University makes an annual report for the valuation and program of future treatments.

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	Not applicable
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 **no education and awareness programme**, despite an identified need

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	Excellent
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Not needed

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

Included in the Tourist Excellence Plan of Lugo (2005-2007) there are some actions related to cultural heritage such as the creation of the Interpretation Centre of the Wall, the installation of mobile tourist office, route in MP3, dramatized visits for the valuing of intangible heritage and the sensitization of inhabitants.

4.7. Visitor Management

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

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

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

Other

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 contact between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry but this is largely **confined to administrative or regulatory matters**

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

No fees are collected

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

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

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

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

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Average
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Poor
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	
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure						
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	The disengagement of the foundations due to the works of the vehicles ring, traffic vibrations, accelerates the process of degradation and settlement of the nucleus of the wall, increasing the pressure that causes cracks and deformations.	Restoration, consolidation and engagement of the damaged areas. Reduction of the traffic in the vehicles ring and historical center. Creation of pedestrian areas inside and outside the walls. Pedestrian rings, green areas has started to be done.	Maintenance plan includes a weekly inspection, the reposition of fallen stone pieces. These actions try to reduce the traffic pressure on the wall as a preventive measure.	Maintenance Plan every four years (2011-2014). It is planned to correct and prevent damages in the wall by the factors that affect it. The new Plan will operate from 2015-2018.	The Xunta de Galicia (regional government) is responsible of restoration works and the maintenance Plan. They are carried out by a restoration firm classed K7E by the State. The Lugo Municipality is making the pedestrian areas.	Creation of pedestrian áreas and Green spaces is being carried out by the Municipality, UE through FEDER Funds and the Provincial Governemnt, in the framework of project Urban 2007-2013.
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
3.7.2	Relative humidity	Due to its situation and environmental conditions (scarce sun radiation, rainfall, etc), the wall is exposed to high relative humidity that increases the proliferation of micro-organisms and plagues that affect the fabric and its integrity.	Balance the effects of the high relative humidity maintaining, if possible, the monument free of vegetation and micro-organisms through the application of treatments and the manual elimination of vegetation.	Supervision and maintenance of the manual cleaning of the vegetation. Annual report that collects the monthly reports about the follow-up of the treatment and the works. Periodic check of the stonework and cleaning of the stone.	There is a four-year maintenance Plan (2011-2014). It is planned to correct and prevent the damages in the wall due to the factors affecting it. The new Plan will operate from 2015-2018.	The Xunta de Galicia (regional government) is responsible of restoration works and the maintenance Plan. They are carried out by a restoration firm classed K7E by the State.	Treatments are determined by the cleaning control carried out by the Botanics Department of the Santiago de Compostela University.
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)	Filtrations with water accumulation in areas with soil filling cause: disintegration of the nucleus because of the washing of the mortars, modification of the basis of the foundations and hydrostatic pushing that affects materials and stability.	Works for the waterproofing in the walkway pavement, modification of the conductions of electric lines, supervision, control and restoration of the municipal network of rainwater and removal of the artificial filling in the original steps.	Maintenance Plan of the Wall includes a weekly supervision of pavements, drainage systems and waterproofing as a preventive measure to avoid water in the Wall.	There is a four-year maintenance Plan (2011-2014). It is planned to correct and prevent the damages in the wall due to the factors affecting it. The new Plan will operate from 2015-2018.	The Xunta de Galicia (regional government) is responsible of restoration works and the maintenance Plan. They are carried out by a restoration firm classed K7E by the State.	The action of water affects also other soil fillings in the closing of the original steps, and it causes pushing on the walls supporting them.
3.7.7	Pests	Weeds and other woody vegetal species as well as other animal species deteriorate the nucleus and the surface of the wall, provoking physical failures in the structure and chemical in materials. They are a negative factor for its stability.	Vegetation control is made by manual extraction (spring, summer, autumn and Winter) and the application of the phytosanitary treatment (spring, autumn). There is a project to investigate the use of new weed-killers.	Vegetal species are continually controlled, their treatment and their effects. There is a follow-up of the treatment and a cataloguing of the possible harmful fauna. There is an annual report that collects the monthly reports.	The four-year Maintenance Plan includes the application of treatments and its control. The current plan started in 2011 and will last to 2014 inclusively. The next new Plan will run from 2015 to 2018.	The Xunta de Galicia (regional government) is responsible of the Maintenance Plan. They are carried out by a restoration firm classed K7E by the State. The Plan follows, for the vegetation control, the guidance of the investigation team of the USC.	Vegetation growth is favored by the soil fillings of the original steps inside the Wall, by the water filtering and the weather that support the micro-organisms.
3.9	Other human activities						
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage	Thefts, graffitti, unsuitable use in the monument, intentional destruction of the fabric and urban furniture deteriorate the external appearance of the wall. Paintings and graffitti on walls damage the fabric of the monument.	Substitution and restoration of urban lamps, cleaning of the affected walls (in case of painting and graffitti), restoration of fabrics and coping. Police survey as well.	The Maintenance Plan foresees weekly check of the wall with the restoration and reposition of the parts and/or damaged elements. Police makes daily supervision.	The Maintenance Plan is four-year long, from 2011 to 2014. A new Plan from 2015 to 2018 is foreseen. There is also periodic survey of the wall made by the local police of the Municipality.	The Xunta de Galicia (regional government) is responsible of the Maintenance Plan. They are carried out by a restoration firm classed K7E by the State. Lugo Municipality is in charge of the surveillance of the wall.	The Roman Wall of Lugo is part of the urban structure of the town. Its walkway is usually used by pedestrians and its gates are an access to the historical centre of the city. Therefore, it is not possible to close the access and its use.
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species						

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	Weeds and other woody vegetal species damage the nucleus and the surface of the wall. They are a negative factor for the stability and integrity of the wall. Nevertheless, there are no foreign invasive species.	Vegetation control is made by manual extraction (spring, summer, autumn and winter) and the application of a phytosanitary treatment (spring, autumn). There is a project to investigate the use of new weed-killers by the University of Santiago de Compostela.	There is a study on the species that affect the walls, the most suitable treatments and its possible effects. There is a monthly survey and a manual cleaning maintenance. Annual report on the follow-up of the application of the treatment.	The Maintenance Plan is four-year, from 2011 to 2014. It includes the application of the treatment and its supervision. There is a new maintenance plan from 2015 to 2018.	The Xunta de Galicia is responsible of the maintenance Plan that is carried out by private firms, following the basic project of an architect. Regarding the vegetation control, it follows the guidance of the investigation group of the University-USC	None.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.3 Management System / Management Plan							
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.3.10	There is little or no contact with industry regarding management	There are no actions because industry in the surroundings of the wall.	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable		
4.4 Financial and Human Resources							
4.4.15	No capacity development plan or programme is in place	No plan to form specialized staff dedicated to management of the monument. It will be one of the objectives to include in the new management plan.	In the next 4 years.	Xunta de Galicia (regional government), owns and management institution. Collaborate City of Lugo, University of Santiago de Compostela (Campus of Lugo)	There have been courses and research. There is still no specific program for its systematic development.		
4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building							
4.6.3	There is no education and awareness programme	There have been isolated educational activities relating to the wall but there is not a comprehensive plan. This aspect will be included in a future management plan.	In the next 4 years.	Xunta de Galicia (regional government), owns and management institution.	The Xunta de Galicia is promoting research on the situation of heritage education in the Autonomous Community to serve as a starting point to conduct coordinated educational activities also include the Wall of Lugo.		
4.7 Visitor Management							
4.7.5	Contact with the tourism industry is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	In the Management Plan there will be the possibility to introduce aspects regarding visitors management, in collaboration with the tourist industry.	In the following 4 years.	Xunta de Galicia. Owner and responsible administration for the management. Tourism Agency of Galicia, responsible of the tourism management in the region. Lugo Municipality, public administration responsible of local tourism.	Not applicable		

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	Positive
Research and monitoring	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Very positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	No impact
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	No impact
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	No impact
Lobbying	No impact
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	No impact
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
External experts

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

yes

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

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

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

UNESCO	Not Applicable
State Party	Not Applicable
Site Managers	Not Applicable
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

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 SOUV is currently under revision by the Advisory Bodies.

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