

ICOMOS

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES
CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES MONUMENTS ET DES SITES
CONSEJO INTERNACIONAL DE MONUMENTOS Y SITIOS
МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ СОВЕТ ПО ВОПРОСАМ ПАМЯТНИКОВ И ДОСТОПРИИМАТЕЛЬНЫХ МЕСТ

Our Ref.GB/AS/1620/IR

Charenton-le-Pont, 20 December 2019

H. E. Mrs Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis
Permanent Delegation of Brazil to UNESCO
Maison de l'UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

World Heritage List 2020

Sítio Roberto Burle Marx (Brazil) - Interim report and additional information request

Dear Ambassador,

As prescribed by the revised *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* and its Annex 6, the Advisory Bodies have been requested to submit a short interim report for each nomination by 31 January 2020. We are therefore pleased to provide you with the relevant information outlining issues related to the evaluation process.

The ICOMOS technical evaluation mission to "Sítio Roberto Burle Marx" was carried out by Ms. Maria Eugenia Bacci (Venezuela) in September 2019. The mission expert highly appreciated the availabilities and support provided by the experts in your country for the organization and implementation of the mission.

On 10 September 2019, a letter was sent by ICOMOS to request further information regarding detailed landscape plans, identification and inventory, the art collections, justification for inscription, comparative analysis, boundaries and buffer zone, state of conservation, protection, and management system/plan. Please convey our thanks to all the officials and experts for the additional information you provided on 12 November 2019 and for their continued cooperation in this process.

In mid- November 2019, the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel evaluated the cultural and mixed properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List in 2020. The additional information provided by the State Party, together with mission and desk review reports were carefully examined by the Panel members. This process will conclude in March 2020.

We thank you for the availability of your Delegation to the meeting held on Thursday 21 November 2019 with representatives of the ICOMOS Panel. The exchange during this meeting was of great help for the third part of the ICOMOS evaluation meeting in which the Panel identified areas where it considers further information is needed.

Therefore, we would be pleased if the State Party could consider the following points:

Landscape principles developed by Burle Marx

The influence and importance of the property can be understood in terms of the landscape principles developed by Burle Marx which he and then others applied in other landscape projects. ICOMOS would be pleased if a summary of these landscape principles could be provided. In addition, it would be useful to receive a map showing where these principles can be found within the property. This information will help to better understand the evolution of the landscape.

Development of modernist landscapes and the modern tropical garden

It would be appreciated if the State Party could provide a broader historical understanding of the development of modernist landscapes and the modern tropical garden, beyond Burle Marx. The nomination dossier focuses on the work of Burle Marx, with little information about the role of other influential designers and their gardens from around the world. ICOMOS is keen to understand the broader international history of modernist landscapes, and the place of the nominated property in that history.

Comparative analysis

ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis appears narrowly focused on existing properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and on a few works by Burle Marx. ICOMOS would be pleased if the State Party could consider the addition of other gardens, created by Burle Marx or other designers, that could be said to reflect Burle Marx landscape principles, not necessarily inscribed on the World Heritage List, nor on Tentative Lists.

In addition, it would be necessary to consider the broader development of modernist landscapes and the modern tropical garden, beyond the role of Burle Marx, by focusing on other influential designers and modernist gardens of a comparable period, especially those which utilize tropical plants.

The expansion of the comparative analysis could consider the following gardens: the Donnell Garden in Honolulu (USA) by Thomas Church, the Lunganga Estate (Sri Lanka) by Geoffrey Bawa, the Miller House (USA) by Dan Kiley, the Wonderland Park (USA) by Garrett Eckbo, the Cultural Center of the Philippines Complex (Philippines) by Idefonso Santos, and the Greenacre park (USA) by Hideo Sasaki in addition to other gardens designed by the American landscape architects James Rose and Robert Royson.

Documentation on the landscape and its evolution

ICOMOS understands that an inventory of the plants of the garden is planned, and that recruitment is ongoing for its achievement. ICOMOS would be pleased to receive information on the process and procedures that will be followed for the completion of the inventory, as well as a tentative calendar for its completion. It would also be useful to receive a sample of the data collected.

It is understood that Burle Marx did not typically create landscape plans, which seems to be the case for this nominated property. Rather the development of the garden was incremental – and executed in an organic way which was not directed in conventional ways using measured drawings and plans. Therefore, primary sources of information about these creative efforts are oral testimonies from those involved with the property around the time of this work. ICOMOS would be pleased to know if the record of these testimonies has been undertaken, or if this is planned as part of future research.

Evidence of experimentation

An important theme in the history of the property is its use as a laboratory for experimentation regarding the development of the modern tropical garden. The nomination dossier presents some information and examples regarding this experimentation. ICOMOS asks if the evidence of this experimentation is comprehensively documented and correlated to the physical form and plantings within the property. Can a sample of such documentation be provided?

While other research may continue at the property, can the State Party confirm the view that its use as a laboratory for experimentation regarding the continuing development of the modern tropical garden has ended?

Protection

ICOMOS understands that there is a municipal law regarding urban development, and a draft bill to regulate the neighbourhood impact study is planned for finalisation in 2020. Could an update be provided about progress with the draft bill, including confirmation of the timetable for finalisation?

Disaster risk management planning

During the technical evaluation mission, it was noted that forest fires and uncontrolled burning are issues for the property. In response, measures have been taken to prevent fires that might come from neighboring areas, including coordination with the managers of adjacent protected areas. Nonetheless, there would

appear to be scope to further strengthen these measures. Can information be provided about options to strengthen prevention measures, including any plans to consider or adopt such measures?

We look forward to your responses to these points, which will be of great help in our evaluation process.

We would be grateful if you could provide **ICOMOS** and the **World Heritage Centre** with the above information **by 28 February 2020 at the latest**, the deadline set out in paragraph 148 of the *Operational Guidelines* for supplementary information on nominations to be received. Please note that any information submitted after this date will not be considered by ICOMOS in its evaluation for the World Heritage Committee. It should be noted, however, that while ICOMOS will carefully consider any supplementary information submitted, it cannot properly evaluate a completely revised nomination or large amounts of new information submitted at the last minute. So we would be grateful if the State Party could keep its response concise and respond only to the above requests.

We thank you for your support of the World Heritage Convention and the evaluation process.

Yours faithfully,



Gwenaëlle Bourdin
Director
ICOMOS Evaluation Unit

Copy to Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional – Iphan
Sítio Roberto Burle Marx (SRBM)
UNESCO World Heritage Centre