

Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage property




Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville

1.2 - World Heritage property details

1.3 - Geographic information table

Name	Coordinates	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
University of Virginia	38.033 / -78.504	11.33	0	11.33	1987
Monticello	37.999 / -78.458	784.63	0	784.63	2015
Total (ha)		795.96	0	795.96	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville - Map of Monticello	1987	
Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville - Map of the University of Virginia	1987	
Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville - map of inscribed property	2015	

1.5 - Web and Social Media data of the property (if applicable)

1. [World Heritage in the United States](#)
2. [Thomas Jefferson - Monticello Virginia](#)
3. [Monticello](#)
4. [Monticello](#)
5. [Grounds Tour - University of Virginia](#)
6. [Short History of University of Virginia](#)
7. [Short History of University of Virginia](#)
8. [Thomas Jefferson's Academical Village](#)
9. [Office of Architect - University of Virginia](#)

2. Other Conventions/Programmes under which the World Heritage property is protected (if applicable)

2.1 - Records indicate that your World Heritage property (in whole or in part) is designated and/or protected under the Conventions/programmes shown in the prefilled table below. Please check and amend as necessary.

		The World Heritage property (in whole or in part) <u>is</u> designated and/or protected under this convention/programme	The World Heritage property (in whole or in part) <u>is not</u> designated and/or protected under this convention/programme
2.1.1	International Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection (1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict)		✗
2.1.2	List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection (Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict)		✗
2.1.3	The List of Wetlands of International Importance (The Ramsar List) (Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention))		✗
2.1.4	World Network of Biosphere Reserves Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme		✗
2.1.5	Global Geoparks Network UNESCO Global Geoparks		✗

2.2 - Please provide comments on 2.1 if necessary

2.3 - Do your national authorities intend to request the granting of Enhanced Protection (if relevant) under the Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict for the World Heritage property in the next three years?

No

2.4 - Do your national authorities intend to designate whole or part of the World Heritage property for inclusion in the List of Wetlands of International Importance (The Ramsar List), if relevant, in the next three years?

No

2.5 - Do your national authorities intend to designate whole or part of the World Heritage property as a Man and Biosphere Reserve (if relevant) in the next three years?

No

2.6 - Do your national authorities intend to apply for whole or part of World Heritage property to be designated as a UNESCO Global Geopark (if relevant) in the next three years?

No

2.7 - Please indicate the level of cooperation at property level between designations under different Conventions/Programmes

2.7.1	1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.2	Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention)	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.5	UNESCO Global Geoparks	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	

2.8 - Please add any further comments on cooperation with the other designation(s)/programme(s)

2.9 - Are you aware of any elements associated with the World Heritage property that have been inscribed on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage?

No

2.10 - Please list any elements associated with the World Heritage property inscribed under the Convention for the Safeguarding of the

Intangible Cultural Heritage of which you are aware

2.11 - Are you aware of any documentary heritage listed under the Memory of the World Programme associated with the World Heritage property?

No

2.12 - Please list any documentary heritage associated with the World Heritage property listed under the Memory of the World Programme of which you are aware.

3. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

3.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property as adopted by the World Heritage Committee

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief synthesis

Monticello was the plantation home of Thomas Jefferson (1743–1826), author of the American Declaration of Independence and third President of the United States. He designed both the plantation home (1769–1809) and his ideal Academical Village (1817–28) situated eight km away in Charlottesville, in central Virginia. The Academical Village still forms the heart of the University of Virginia, and exhibits a unique U-shaped plan dominated by the Rotunda with pavilions, hotels, student rooms, and gardens arrayed in rows to its south. The buildings are excellent and highly personalized examples of Neoclassicism, shown in their relationship to the natural setting and their blending of functionalism and symbolism. They were inspired by deep study of classical and contemporary examples and reflect Jefferson's aspirations for the character of the new American republic. Both works have drawn international attention from the time of their construction.

Jefferson's Monticello and his Academical Village precinct are notable for the originality of their plans and designs and for the refinement of their proportions and décor. His house at Monticello, with its dome, porticos supported by Doric columns, and cornices and friezes derived from classical Roman buildings, and his Academical Village, with its Rotunda modeled on the Pantheon and its ten pavilions each offering a different lesson in the classical orders and architecture as drawn from published classical models, together invoke the ideals of ancient Rome regarding freedom, nobility, self-determination, and prosperity linked to education and agricultural values.

Criterion (i): Both Monticello and the University of Virginia reflect Jefferson's wide reading of classical and later works on architecture and design and also his careful study of the architecture of late 18th-century Europe. As such they illustrate his wide diversity of interests.

Criterion (iv): With these buildings Thomas Jefferson made a significant contribution to Neoclassicism, the 18th-century movement that adapted the forms and details of classical architecture to contemporary buildings.

Criterion (vi): Monticello and the key buildings of the University of Virginia are directly and materially associated with the ideas and ideals of Thomas Jefferson. Both the University buildings and Monticello were directly inspired by principles derived from his deep knowledge of classical architecture and philosophy.

Integrity

Within the boundaries of Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville are located all the elements necessary to understand and express the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, including, at Monticello, both the house and the core area of the estate, which preserves the house's setting in the scenic Southwest Mountains in the Virginia Piedmont; and, at the University of Virginia, all the key buildings of Jefferson's Academical Village and its associated landscape features. The property is thus of sufficient size to adequately ensure the complete representation of the features and processes that convey the property's significance. There is no buffer zone for the property.

The house at Monticello is intact and unchanged beyond some mid 20th-century physical repairs, which include the insertion of steel beams to support the floors and the addition of temperature and humidity controls. Land has been acquired, much of it placed in conservation easement, to secure views from the mountaintop. The University of Virginia continues to raise its standards for the stewardship of the Jeffersonian precinct and has instituted systematic actions to curate and maintain the buildings. The overall integrity of the many components is remarkably good, considering their constant use. The property does not suffer from adverse effects of development and/or neglect.

Authenticity

"Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville" is substantially authentic in terms of its forms and designs, materials and substance, and locations and settings, as well as, for the University's Academical Village, its uses and functions. The property owned by the Thomas Jefferson Foundation at Monticello is largely part of the original tract of land owned by Jefferson. Monticello was never greatly altered after his death. Additionally, the Foundation has undertaken archaeological investigations to determine the locations of roads, gardens and other landscape features.

The Jeffersonian precinct of the University has been in continuous use for its original purposes since its construction. Only the Rotunda has been much changed: a serious fire that nearly destroyed the building in 1895 was followed by a restoration and reconfiguration designed by architect Stanford White with the full understanding of the sources of Jefferson's inspiration. A Jeffersonian interior was recreated in the Rotunda in the 1970s. Extensions have been made to the rear of most of the pavilions, and the gardens behind them were redesigned in the mid 20th century in a Colonial Revival style based on early 19th-century garden layouts and heirloom plants.

The greatest threats to the property are commercial development in Monticello's extensive view shed and, for the Academical Village, relative humidity, pollution and invasive species. The Thomas Jefferson Foundation is addressing development issues, and the University is addressing continuing humidity issues, has installed scrubbers on its coal power plant to reduce emissions, and is inoculating trees against the Emerald Ash Borer.

Protection and management requirements

Monticello is owned and administered by the Thomas Jefferson Foundation, Inc., a private, non-profit organization. Jefferson's Academical Village precinct, administered as part of the University of Virginia, is owned by the Commonwealth of Virginia. Monticello and the University of Virginia Historic District (which includes the Academical Village and the University's Rotunda) were designated by the Secretary of the Interior as National Historic Landmarks in 1960 and 1971, respectively. The Rotunda was also individually designated in 1965.

The Thomas Jefferson Foundation's express purpose is to preserve and maintain Monticello as a national memorial, and it has a staff of professionals to support this work. A detailed strategic plan (2012), including a tourism plan, is supplemented by a Historic Structures Report (1991) and a restoration master plan (1996). The Foundation also has a strong working relationship with the local governing bodies. A visitor center provides services and interpretation as well as ticketing and visitor amenities. The University of Virginia, an agency of the Commonwealth of Virginia, is advised by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, which under State law reviews all major changes to the Academical Village, as does the Virginia Art and Architecture Review Board. The University employs a multi-disciplinary team of preservation professionals and tradespersons to plan, manage, and execute work on the buildings and landscape in the historic precinct. The Historic Preservation Advisory Committee includes preservation professionals and University of Virginia faculty members, and advises the Architect for the University on proposed

projects. A Historic Structure Report exists for the Academical Village and others have been commissioned for nine of the individual buildings within the precinct. Part I of a Cultural Landscape Report for the precinct has also been completed. Archaeological investigations precede any significant subsurface disturbance related to either building or landscape projects. The University adopted in 2011 a "Planning Framework and Design Guidelines for the Academical Village". The "University of Virginia Historic Preservation Framework Plan" (2007) provides also guidance for post-Jefferson structures in the precinct. The Academical Village precinct does not yet have a formal management plan, nor does the World Heritage property as a whole. There is nevertheless a strong cooperative and collaborative relationship between Monticello and the University of Virginia. Sustaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property over time will require an integrated planning approach thereby ensuring that the authenticity and integrity of the property are not compromised by identified or potential threats, including development and environmental factors.

3.2 - Please list the key attributes of Outstanding Universal Value of your property and give an assessment of their condition. As a guideline, it is suggested to focus on approximately five key attributes (no more than 15 overall).

	Brief identification of attribute	Preserved	Compromised	Seriously compromised	Lost
3.2.1	Plans and designs	✖			
3.2.2	Landscapes associated with the structures	✖			
3.2.3	Exterior Neoclassical architectural features	✖			
3.2.4	Interior Neoclassical architectural features	✖			
3.2.5					
3.2.6					
3.2.7					
3.2.8					
3.2.9					
3.2.10					
3.2.11					
3.2.12					
3.2.13					
3.2.14					
3.2.15					

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

Both Monticello and the historic buildings found within the University of Virginia's WHS boundaries remain well preserved. Professional preservationists, conservationists, and historians at both sites protect the attributes contributing to the sites' shared OUV.

4. Factors Affecting the Property

4.1. Buildings and Development

4.1.1 - Housing

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Outside

✖ Relevant			Not relevant				
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✖		✖		✖		➡	

4.1.2 - Commercial development

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Outside

✖ Relevant			Not relevant				
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✖		✖		✖		➡	

4.1.3 - Industrial areas

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.1.4 - Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Outside

Relevant

✕ Not relevant










4.1.5 - Interpretative and visitation facilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Inside

✕ Relevant

Not relevant

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕			→	
 Negative							

4.1.6 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.1 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.2. Transportation Infrastructure

4.2.1 - Ground transport infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Outside

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.2.2 - Underground transport infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Outside

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.2.3 - Air transport infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.2.4 - Marine transport infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.2.5 - Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.2.6 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.2 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.3. Services Infrastructures

4.3.1 - Water infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.3.2 - Renewable energy facilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Inside

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.3.3 - Non-renewable energy facilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Outside

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.3.4 - Localised utilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.3.5 - Major linear utilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.3.6 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.3 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.4. Pollution

4.4.1 - Pollution of marine waters

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.2 - Ground water pollution

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.3 - Surface water pollution

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.4 - Air pollution

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Outside

✕ Relevant			Not relevant				
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔊 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕	✕			✕	↘		

4.4.5 - Solid waste

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.6 - Input of excess energy

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.4 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Air pollution has a minor negative impact on exterior architectural elements. Current trends toward greater use of renewable energy and electric vehicles are reducing the negative impacts.

4.5. Biological resource use/modification

4.5.1 - Fishing/collecting aquatic resources

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.2 - Aquaculture

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.3 - Land conversion

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Inside, Outside

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.4 - Livestock farming/Grazing of domesticated animals

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Inside

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.5 - Crop production

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Inside

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.6 - Commercial wild plant collection

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.7 - Subsistence wild plant collection

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.8 - Commercial hunting

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.9 - Subsistence hunting

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.10 - Forestry/Wood production

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.11 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.5 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.6. Physical resource extraction

4.6.1 - Mining

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.6.2 - Quarrying

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.6.3 - Oil and gas

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.6.4 - Water (extraction)

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.6.5 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.6 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.7. Local conditions affecting physical fabric

4.7.1 - Wind

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.2 - Relative humidity

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Outside

✕ Relevant	Not relevant						
Impact	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
	🔥 Current	🔥 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕	✕			✕		→	

4.7.3 - Temperature

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.4 - Radiation/Light

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.5 - Dust

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.6 - Water (rain/water table)

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Outside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔨 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕		✕	Negative ✕	✕			↗

4.7.7 - Pests

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Outside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔨 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕		✕		✕		→	

4.7.8 - Micro-organisms

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Outside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔨 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕		✕		✕		→	

4.7.9 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.7 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Character-defining wooden architectural elements at both sites are vulnerable to humidity, pests, fungal attacks, etc. The trend is steady.

4.8. Social/Cultural uses of heritage

4.8.1 - Ritual/Spiritual/Religious and associative uses

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Inside

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.8.2 - Society's valuing of heritage

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.8.3 - Indigenous hunting, gathering and collecting

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.8.4 - Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.8.5 - Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant










4.8.6 - Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Inside

✕ Relevant

Not relevant

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕			→	
 Negative							

4.8.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.8 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.9. Other human activities

4.9.1 - Illegal activities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.9.2 - Deliberate destruction of heritage

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.9.3 - Military training

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.9.4 - War

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.9.5 - Terrorism

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.9.6 - Civil unrest

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.9.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.9 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.10. Climate change and severe weather events














4.10.1 - Storms

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Outside

✕ Relevant

Not relevant

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative 							

4.10.2 - Flooding

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.10.3 - Drought

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Outside

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.10.4 - Desertification

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.10.5 - Changes to oceanic waters

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.10.6 - Temperature change

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.10.7 - Other climate change impacts

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.10.8 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.10 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.11. Sudden ecological or geological events

4.11.1 - Volcanic eruption

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant














Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.11.2 - Earthquake

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Outside

 Relevant	Not relevant
--	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative 							

4.11.3 - Tsunami/Tidal wave

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.11.4 - Avalanche/Landslide

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.11.5 - Erosion and siltation/Deposition

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant










4.11.6 - Fire (wildfire)

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Inside, Outside

✕ Relevant

Not relevant

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕		✕	Negative ✕	✕		→	

4.11.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.11 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Central Virginia is associated with a minor fault line which means there is some risk of earthquakes. The last one was in 2011. Monticello is also surrounded by woodland and there is a minor risk due to wildfire.

4.12. Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species

4.12.1 - Translocated species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.12.2 - Invasive/Alien terrestrial species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Outside

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.12.3 - Invasive/Alien freshwater species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.12.4 - Invasive/Alien marine species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.12.5 - Hyper-abundant species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.12.6 - Modified genetic material

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Not relevant



Relevant

✕ Not relevant





4.12.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.12 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.13. Management and institutional factors


4.13.1 - Management system/Management plan

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕			→	
 Negative							

4.13.2 - Legal framework

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕			→	
 Negative							

4.13.3 - Governance

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕			→	
 Negative							

4.13.4 - Management activities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕			→	
 Negative							

4.13.5 - Financial resources

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕			→	
 Negative							








4.13.6 - Human resources

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕			→	
 Negative							

4.13.7 - Low impact research/monitoring activities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Potential, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕			→	
 Negative							

4.13.8 - High impact research/monitoring activities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (19/08/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Potential, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕			→	
 Negative							

























4.13.9 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.13 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.14. Other factor(s)

4.14.1 - Other factor(s)

4.15. Factors Summary Table

4.15.1 - Factors Summary Table






Name	Impact		Origin		Trend	
4.1 Buildings and Development						
4.1.1 Housing					→	
4.1.2 Commercial development					→	
4.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities					→	
4.4 Pollution						
4.4.4 Air pollution					↘	
4.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
4.7.2 Relative humidity					→	
4.7.6 Water (rain/water table)					↗	
4.7.7 Pests					→	
4.7.8 Micro-organisms					→	
4.8 Social/Cultural uses of heritage						

4.8.6 Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation						
4.10 Climate change and severe weather events						
4.10.1 Storms						
4.11 Sudden ecological or geological events						
4.11.2 Earthquake						
4.11.6 Fire (wildfire)						
4.13 Management and institutional factors						
4.13.1 Management system/Management plan						
4.13.2 Legal framework						
4.13.3 Governance						
4.13.4 Management activities						
4.13.5 Financial resources						
4.13.6 Human resources						
4.13.7 Low impact research/monitoring activities						
4.13.8 High impact research/monitoring activities						
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside




4.16. Assessment of current and potential positive and negative factors

4.16.1 - Assessment of current and potential negative and positive factors

4.1 Buildings and Development



Name		Impact			Origin		Trend
4.1.1 Housing							
							
Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor							
	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
	Widespread						
Temporal scale - Occurence of the impact							

	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.1.2 Commercial development						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread



Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing





4.4 Pollution

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.4.4 Air pollution						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
X	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
X	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
X	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
X	Static
	Increasing

4.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.7.2 Relative humidity			
			
			

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
X	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
X	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
X	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
X	Medium capacity

	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.7.6 Water (rain/water table)			
	<div> <div>⊖</div> <div></div> <div>📌</div> </div>	<div> <div>↺</div> <div>↻</div> <div>↗</div> </div>	<div> <div>↗</div> </div>

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
✕	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major




Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.7.7 Pests			
	<div> <div>⊖</div> <div></div> <div>📌</div> </div>	<div> <div>↺</div> <div>↻</div> <div>↗</div> </div>	<div> <div>→</div> </div>

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive





	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
✕	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.7.8 Micro-organisms						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
✕	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity

	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

4.8 Social/Cultural uses of heritage

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.8.6 Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation	 		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread





Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing





4.10 Climate change and severe weather events

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.10.1 Storms	 		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
--	--

	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
✕	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

4.11 Sudden ecological or geological events

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.11.2 Earthquake						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
✕	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant

	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.11.6 Fire (wildfire)			
	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>	<div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>	<div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
✕	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major





Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

4.13 Management and institutional factors





Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.1 Management system/Management plan	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>	<div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>	<div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor											
	Restricted										
	Localised										
	Extensive										
	Widespread										
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact											
	One off or rare										
	Intermittent or sporadic										
	Frequent										
	On-going										
Impact - Impact on the attributes											
	Insignificant										
	Minor										
	Significant										
	Major										
Management response - Capacity of management to respond											
	High capacity										
	Medium capacity										
	Low capacity										
	No capacity and / or resources										
Trend - Development over the last 6 years											
	Decreasing										
	Static										
	Increasing										

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.13.2 Legal framework						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor											
	Restricted										
	Localised										
	Extensive										
	Widespread										
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact											
	One off or rare										
	Intermittent or sporadic										
	Frequent										
	On-going										
Impact - Impact on the attributes											
	Insignificant										
	Minor										

	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
	Increasing




Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.3 Governance	 		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread




Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.4 Management activities	 		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor							
	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
X	Widespread						
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact							
	One off or rare						
	Intermittent or sporadic						
	Frequent						
X	On-going						
Impact - Impact on the attributes							
	Insignificant						
	Minor						
X	Significant						
	Major						
Management response - Capacity of management to respond							
X	High capacity						
	Medium capacity						
	Low capacity						
	No capacity and / or resources						
Trend - Development over the last 6 years							
	Decreasing						
X	Static						
	Increasing						

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.13.5 Financial resources						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor

	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.6 Human resources	<div>+</div> <div>!</div> <div></div>	<div>+</div> <div></div> <div></div>	<div>→</div>

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread





Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.7 Low impact research/monitoring activities	<div>+</div> <div>!</div> <div></div>	<div>+</div> <div></div> <div></div>	<div>→</div>

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor							
	Restricted						
	Localised						
X	Extensive						
	Widespread						
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact							
	One off or rare						
	Intermittent or sporadic						
	Frequent						
X	On-going						
Impact - Impact on the attributes							
	Insignificant						
	Minor						
X	Significant						
	Major						
Management response - Capacity of management to respond							
X	High capacity						
	Medium capacity						
	Low capacity						
	No capacity and / or resources						
Trend - Development over the last 6 years							
	Decreasing						
X	Static						
	Increasing						

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.13.8 High impact research/monitoring activities						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
X	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
X	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
X	Insignificant
	Minor

	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

4.17. Serial inscriptions (national or transnational)

4.17.1 - If your property is a serial inscription (national or transnational) please identify which components of the property are impacted by each factor

In general, both Monticello and the University of Virginia are similarly impacted by the stated factors. However, housing, commercial development, and wildfires potentially have a greater impact on Monticello.

4.18. Prediction of the state of conservation at next cycle of Periodic Reporting.

4.18.1 - Please predict what the state of conservation of each attribute will be approximately 6 years from now (at the time of the next cycle of Periodic Reporting)

	Attribute	Preserved	Compromised	Seriously compromised	Lost
4.18.1.1	Design and Plan	✕			
4.18.1.2	Surrounding landscape	✕			
4.18.1.3	Exterior architectural elements	✕			
4.18.1.4	Interior architectural elements	✕			
4.18.1.5					

5. Protection and Management of the Property

5.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

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

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

5.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known and recognised?

The boundaries **are known by both** the management authority and local communities/landowners

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

The property has **no buffer zone** and **does not need one**

5.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the buffer zones known and recognised?

The property has **no known and recognised** buffer zone

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

5.2. Protective Measures

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

Monticello is owned by the Thomas Jefferson Foundation, Inc., a private, non-profit organization, and administered as a national memorial and museum to keep alive the name and memory of Thomas Jefferson. The Foundation's board of trustees consists of sixteen members.

The Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, on behalf of the Commonwealth as owners of the Jeffersonian Precinct, are the principal agents with regard to the administration of the site. They are advised on a routine basis by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and Architectural Review Board. Preservation matters are addressed by the Architect for the University and the Department of Facilities Management.

Monticello (private ownership) and the University of Virginia (public ownership) have been designated National Historic Landmarks.

University of Virginia

National:

As a designated National Historic Landmark district, all proposed projects are reviewed under Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 whenever the University undertakes projects funded by federal grants or requiring permits from federal agencies, a situation that rarely affects any of the University's historic properties. In reviewing plans submitted by the University of Virginia, The Virginia Department of Historic Resources applies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Structures and Landscapes.

State:

2.1-488.4B of the Code of Virginia provides that no building or appurtenant structure shall be removed from state-owned property unless approved by the Governor upon the advice of the Art and Architectural Review Board. The Governor further conditions approval upon the recommendation of the Council on the Environment, the Division of Historic Landmarks of the Department of Conservation and Historic Resources and the Department of General Services.

New State code§ 2.2-2402.B. Governor's approval of works of art; removal, etc.; structures, fixtures and works of art placed on or extending over state property (<http://leg1.state.va.us/cgi-bin/legp504.exe?000+cod+2.2-2402>)

The specific provisions for review of rehabilitation and restoration projects are defined in the Budget Bill Section 4-4.01(s), 2000 Virginia Acts of Assembly, Chapter 1073: To guarantee that the historical and/or architectural integrity of any stateowned properties listed on the Virginia Landmarks Register and the knowledge to be gained from archaeological sites will not be adversely affected because of inappropriate changes, the heads of those agencies in charge of such properties are directed to submit all plans for significant alterations, remodeling, redecoration, restoration or repairs that may basically alter the appearance of the structure, landscaping, or demolition to the Department of Historic Resources. Such plans shall be reviewed within thirty days and the comments of that department shall be submitted to the Governor through the Department of General Services for use in making a final determination.

Local:

As a state agency, The University of Virginia is exempt from compliance with local codes and ordinances.

Monticello

Because Monticello is privately owned, federal and state preservation laws do not apply (except when federal or state funds or permits are involved). However, the Thomas Jefferson Foundation has a strong working relationship with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

Source: Periodic Reporting Cycle 1; Periodic Reporting Cycle 2

Comment

Replace the first paragraph with: Monticello is owned by the Thomas Jefferson Foundation. The Foundation was incorporated in 1923 to preserve and operate Monticello, the plantation home and architectural masterpiece of Thomas Jefferson. It is a private non-profit Foundation managed by a board of trustees and dedicated to a two-fold mission of preservation and education.

5.2.2 - Please list any legislation and other measures (regulatory -including spatial planning- contractual, institutional or traditional) not included in 5.2.1 and indicate the category

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

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

5.2.4 - 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 has no buffer zone

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

The legal framework for the broader setting of the World Heritage property provides an adequate 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

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

There is adequate capacity/resources to enforce legislation and/or regulation in the World Heritage property

5.2.7 - Please provide a short summary of how the legislation, including spatial planning and other regulation, works in practice

5.2.8 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations about the information related to the measures taken to protect the World Heritage property

5.3. Management System/Management Plan

5.3.1 - Please check the box which most closely match the character of the governance and management system of the property

Other

If 'Other', please specify

UVA-Public management system at provincial/regional level; Monticello-Charitable management (e.g. by NGO)

5.3.2 - Management System: Please indicate which of the various management tools listed below are used to help protect the property.

<input type="checkbox"/>	A statutory Management Plan or zoning plan for the property.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other forms of statutory or non-statutory plans (e.g. strategic plans)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Governance mechanisms that foster and respect traditional practices, knowledge and uses of the property
<input type="checkbox"/>	An annual work plan or business plan

5.3.3 - Please give a brief description of the management system currently in place at your property**5.3.4 - Management Documents****5.3.5 - Has any use been made of the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape in developing policies and best practices for the protection of this property?**

No use has been made of the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape

5.3.6 - If the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation has been used at this property, please describe briefly what has been done.**5.3.7 - Has any use been made of the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Properties at the property?**

No use has been made of the World Heritage Policy for Climate Change

5.3.8 - If the Climate Change policy has been used, please briefly describe what has been done along with any research on the impacts of Climate Change on the property:**5.3.9 - Has any use been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties at the property ?**

No use has been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties

5.3.10 - If the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties has been used, please briefly describe what has been done**5.3.11 - Rate the coordination between the various levels of administration (i.e. national/federal; regional/provincial/state; local/municipal etc.) involved in the management of the World Heritage property**

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

5.3.12 - 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

5.3.13 - Is the management system being implemented?

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

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

An annual work/action plan **exists** and all of its activities are being implemented and monitored

5.3.15 - Does the management system include formal mechanisms and procedures that ensure participation and contribution of the following groups, living within or near the World Heritage property and/or buffer zone in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property?

		Not applicable	No mechanisms for participation	Some participation	Direct participation	Transformative participation in all relevant decision processes
5.3.15.1	Local communities				✗	
5.3.15.2	Local authorities				✗	
5.3.15.3	Landowners in the property and the buffer zone	✗				
5.3.15.4	Indigenous peoples			✗		
5.3.15.5	Women					✗
5.3.15.6	Other specific groups				✗	
	If you selected, 'Other specific groups' please specify	Descendants of Monticello's enslaved community				

5.3.16 - Please rate the cooperation/relationship between the World Heritage property managers/coordinators/staff and the following groups

		Not applicable	Non-existent	Poor	Fair	Good
5.3.16.1	Local communities					✗
5.3.16.2	Local/Municipal authorities					✗
5.3.16.3	Indigenous peoples			✗		
5.3.16.4	Landowners				✗	
5.3.16.5	Women					✗

5.3.16.6	Youth/Children					×
5.3.16.7	Researchers					×
5.3.16.8	Local Visitors/Tourists					×
5.3.16.9	National/International tourists					×
5.3.16.10	Tourism Industry					×
5.3.16.11	Local businesses and industries				×	
5.3.16.12	NGOs				×	
5.3.16.13	Other specific groups	×				
	If you selected 'Other specific groups', please specify					

5.3.17 - Please rate the extent to which the management system of your property contributes towards achieving the objectives of the World Heritage Committee's Policy for the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the *World Heritage Convention*

		Not applicable	No contribution	Limited	Significant	Full achievement
5.3.17.1	The management system of the property contributes to gender equality				×	
5.3.17.2	The management system of the property provides ecosystem services/benefits to the local community (e.g. fresh air, water, food, medicinal plants)				×	
5.3.17.3	The management system of the property contributes to social inclusion and equity, improving opportunities for all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status				×	
5.3.17.4	The management system of the property integrates a human rights-based approach			×		
5.3.17.5	The management system of the property contributes to fostering inclusive local economic development, and to enhancing livelihood			×		
5.3.17.6	The management system of the property contributes to conflict prevention, including respect for cultural diversity within and around the World Heritage property				×	

5.3.18 - Please provide further details on the ratings of the management system given in the table above

5.3.19 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the management system/plan

6. Financial and Human Resources

6.1. Funding

6.1.1 - If your funding sources do not exactly fit those shown, put the relevant amounts against the funding type that most closely represents your situation, and use the comment box below to provide more details.

		Project costs	Running costs
6.1.1.1	Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc.)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.2	Bilateral international funding	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.3	World Heritage Fund (International Assistance)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.4	Contribution from other conventions and programmes	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.5	International donations (NGOs, foundations, etc.)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.6	Governmental (national/federal)	10 %	5 %
6.1.1.7	Governmental (regional/provincial/state)	5 %	5 %
6.1.1.8	Governmental (local/municipal)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.9	In-country donations (NGOs, foundations, etc.)	50 %	10 %
6.1.1.10	Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, toilets, parking, camping fees, etc.)	5 %	30 %
6.1.1.11	Commercial activities (e.g. merchandising and catering, filming permit, concessions, etc.)	5 %	30 %
6.1.1.12	Other	25 %	20 %
		Total 100 %	Total 100 %

6.1.2 - Please comment here on any other aspects of funding sources not covered in the table above

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

The available budget is adequate for effective management of the World Heritage property

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

The existing sources of funding are secure over both the medium- and long-term

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

6.1.6 - Estimate the distribution of men and women involved in the management, conservation, interpretation of the World Heritage properties and the extent to which they are drawn from local communities.

		From local communities %	From elsewhere %
6.1.6.1	Men	50 %	50 %
6.1.6.2	Women	50 %	50 %
		Total 100 %	Total 100 %

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

Human resources are adequate for management needs

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

Conservation	Good
Environmental sustainability	Good
Community participation and inclusion	Good
Risk preparedness	Good
Capacity development and education	Good
Administration	Good
Research and monitoring	Good
Awareness raising and public information/communication	Good
Marketing and promotion	Good
Interpretation	Good
Visitor management/tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

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

Conservation	Good
Environmental sustainability	Good
Community participation and inclusion	Good
Risk preparedness	Good
Capacity development and education	Good
Administration	Good
Research and monitoring	Good
Awareness raising and public information/communication	Good
Marketing and promotion	Good
Interpretation	Good
Visitor management/tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

6.1.10 - Has any use been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building at the property?

No use has been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building

6.1.11 - If the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building has been used, please briefly describe what has been done.

6.1.12 - Are there site-specific capacity building plans or programmes that develop local expertise and that contribute to the transfer of skills for the conservation and management of the World Heritage property?

A site-based capacity building plan or programme is in place and fully implemented; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally

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

7. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

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

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

7.3 - Are results from research programmes publicly available and disseminated?

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

8. Education, Information and Awareness Building

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

Local communities	Poor
Local/municipal authorities	Poor
Indigenous peoples	Poor
Landowners	Poor
Women	Poor
Youth/children	Poor
Researchers	Fair
Local visitors	Poor
National/international tourists	Fair
Tourism industry	Fair
Local businesses and industries	Poor
NGOs	Poor
Other specific groups	Not applicable
If you selected 'Other specific groups', please describe	

8.2 - Does the property have a heritage education programme(s) for children and/or youth, that can contribute to a better understanding of heritage, promote diversity and foster intercultural dialogue?

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

8.3 - Who are the target audiences for education and awareness programmes at your property?

Local communities
Local/municipal authorities
Indigenous peoples
Landowners
Women
Youth/children
Researchers
Local Visitors
National/international tourists
Tourism industry

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

Visitor centre	Good
Site museum	Fair
Information booths	Fair
Guided tours	Good
Trails/routes	Good
Printed information materials	Good
Online (website, social media, etc.)	Good
Transportation facilities	Fair
Other	Not needed
If 'Other' is selected, please specify	

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

9. Visitor Management

9.1 - Please provide estimated annual visitor numbers (including national and international visitors) since the last Periodic Report

Monticello: 300,000; UVA: 122,400 / Monticello: 277,000; UVA 54,405 / Monticello: 131,000; UVA: NA / Monticello: 389,000; UVA: NA / Monticello: 410,000; UVA: NA /

9.2 - What information sources are used to collect visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries

9.3 - What is the average length stay of a visitor to the World Heritage property?

One to three hours

9.4 - Please provide the source of information

Monticello - Visitor Surveys

9.5 - What is the approximate average daily visitor expenditure? (Please provide an estimated monetary figure in USD)

NA / UVA - NA; Monticello - \$3.30 / NA / UVA - NA; Monticello - \$31.50 / NA / UVA- NA; Monticello - \$10.03 /

9.6 - Please provide the source of information

9.7 - Does the management system/plan for the World Heritage property include a strategy with an action plan to manage visitors, tourism activity and its derived economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts?

There is a planned and **effective strategy** to manage visitors, tourism activity and its derived impacts on the World Heritage property

9.8 - Please provide any comments relating to the answer provided above in question 9.7

9.9 - Is visitor use effectively managed to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property?

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

9.10 - Is the effectiveness of tourism management regularly monitored?

No

If a different system, please specify

9.11 - How does the tourism industry cooperate with the site management to improve visitor experiences and maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property?

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

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

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is **not adequately presented and interpreted**

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

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

9.14 - How does visitor/tourism revenue (e.g. entry charges, permits) contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

Fees are collected and make a **substantial contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

9.15 - Are there locally driven sustainable tourism initiatives?

Yes

If 'Yes', please specify

Local and state tourism boards

9.16 - Are the benefits of tourism shared with local communities?

Yes

If 'Yes', please specify

Jobs and bringing tourists to local businesses

9.17 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to visitation/tourism/public use of the World Heritage property

10. Monitoring

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

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

10.2 - Is necessary information available in order to define key indicators for measuring the state of conservation and are they used in monitoring how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is being maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is **adequate and key indicators have been defined** for measuring the state of conservation and **are being used in monitoring** of how the Outstanding Universal value of the property is being maintained

10.3 - Are key indicators defined and in place for the following principal aspects of the property?

	Extend of indicators	Not applicable	No indicators	Indicators have been defined but are not yet in use	Indicators are in place and in use since the last Periodic Reporting cycle
10.3.1	State of conservation				×
10.3.2	Effectiveness of the management system		×		
10.3.3	Character of governance		×		
10.3.4	Appropriate synergy with other conservation designations		×		
10.3.5	Contribution to sustainable development	×			
10.3.6	Capacity development		×		

10.4 - Please provide information on relevant key indicators adopted at the property

Annual preservation inspections of the historic structures.

10.5 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups:

World Heritage managers/coordinators and staff	Good
Local/municipal authorities	Not applicable
Local communities	Not applicable
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Not applicable
Women	Good
Researchers	Fair
Tourism industry	Not applicable
Local businesses and industry	Not applicable
NGOs	Not applicable
Other specific groups	Not applicable
If you selected 'Other specific groups', please specify	

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

No relevant Committee recommendations to implement

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

10.8 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to Monitoring

11. Identification of Priority Management Needs

11.1 - Identification of Priority Management Needs

5.1	Boundaries and Buffer Zones	
5.1.3	The property has no buffer zone	
5.1.4	The property has no known and recognised buffer zone	✕
5.2	Protective Measures	
5.2.4	The property has no buffer zone	✕
5.3	Management System/Management Plan	
5.3.5	No use has been made of the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation to develop policies and best practices for the protection of the property	
5.3.7	No use has been made of the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Properties at the property	✕
5.3.9	No use has been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties at the property	✕
5.3.17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In a limited manner, the management system of the World Heritage property does integrate a human rights-based approach In a limited manner, the management system of the World Heritage property does contribute to fostering inclusive local economic development, and to enhancing livelihood 	✕
6.1	Funding	
6.1.10	No use has been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Development at the World Heritage property	✕
9	Visitor Management	
9.11	There is limited cooperation between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation	
9.12	The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is not adequately presented and interpreted	✕

Please select 3 more issues.

☒ Please save this question to reflect changes

12. Summary and Conclusions

12.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

12.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

4.1	Buildings and Development						
4.1.1	Housing	i, iv, vi	Monticello: Actively working with local planning departments to reduce impacts to Monticello's viewshed	Monticello - Monitored by coordinating with local planning departments	Ongoing	Monticello: County of Albemarle	NA
4.1.2	Commercial development	i, iv, vi	Monticello: Actively working with local planning departments to reduce impacts to Monticello's viewshed	Monticello - Monitored by coordinating with local planning departments	Ongoing	Monticello: County of Albemarle	NA
4.4	Pollution						
4.4.4	Air pollution	i, iv	Periodic cleaning	Condition surveys	Ongoing	NA	NA
4.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
4.7.2	Relative humidity	i, iv	Monticello: Active climate control in the house; exterior condition surveys	Exterior condition surveys	Ongoing	NA	NA
4.7.6	Water (rain/water table)	i, iv	Condition surveys	Ongoing	Ongoing	NA	NA
4.7.7	Pests	i, iv	Condition surveys	ongoing	Ongoing	NA	NA
4.7.8	Micro-organisms	i, iv	Condition surveys	ongoing	ongoing	NA	NA
4.10	Climate change and severe weather events						

4.10.1	Storms	i, iv	Severe weather planning and policies	Ongoing	Ongoing	NA	Risk is minor but rising with the changing climate.
4.11	Sudden ecological or geological events						
4.11.2	Earthquake	i, iv	Disaster mitigation planning	Ongoing	Ongoing	NA	Very minor risk
4.11.6	Fire (wildfire)	i, iv	Monitoring neighboring forests	Ongoing	Ongoing	NA	NA
Summary - Factors affecting the Property completed							

12.2. Summary - Management Needs

12.2.1 - Summary - Management Needs

5.1		Boundaries and Buffer Zones									
		Actions		Timeframe		Lead agency (and others involved)		More info / comment			
5.1.4		The property has no known and recognised buffer zone		n/a		n/a		n/a			
5.2		Protective Measures									
5.2.4		The property has no buffer zone		n/a		n/a		n/a			
5.3		Management System/Management Plan									
5.3.7		No use has been made of the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Properties at the property		n/a		n/a		n/a		No actions are planned.	
5.3.9		No use has been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties at the property		No actions are planned.		n/a		n/a		n/a	
5.3.17		<ul style="list-style-type: none">In a limited manner , the management system of the World Heritage property does integrate a human rights-based approachIn a limited manner , the management system of the World Heritage property does contribute to fostering inclusive local economic development, and to enhancing livelihood		n/a		n/a		n/a		No actions are planned.	
6.1		Funding									

6.1.10	No use has been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Development at the World Heritage property	n/a	n/a	n/a	No actions are planned.
9	Visitor Management				
9.12	The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is not adequately presented and interpreted	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Summary - Management Needs completed

12.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

12.3.1 - Following the analysis undertaken for this report, what is the current state of Authenticity of the World Heritage property?

12.3.2 - Following the analysis undertaken for this report, what is the current state of Integrity of the World Heritage property?

12.3.3 - Following the analysis undertaken for this report, what is the current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value?

12.3.4 - What is the current state of the property's other values?

12.3.5 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the state of conservation of the property.

13. Impact of World Heritage Status

13.1 - 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	Very positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Very positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Very positive
Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	Very positive
International cooperation	Very positive
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal/Policy framework	No impact
Advocacy	Very positive
Institutional coordination	Very positive
Security	No impact
Gender equality	No impact
Provision of ecosystem services/ benefits to local communities	No impact
Social inclusion and equity, and improvement of opportunities for all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, ethnicity, origin, religion, or economic or other status	No impact
Fostering inclusive local economic development and enhancing livelihood	Positive
Contributing to conflict prevention, including respect for cultural diversity within and around heritage properties	No impact
Other	Not applicable

If 'Other', please specify

13.2 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to World Heritage status and its impacts

14. Good Practice in the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention

14.1 - Example of good practice in World Heritage protection, identification, conservation or management at the property level

At Monticello, an example is the long-term support of a Restoration Department staffed by professional conservators and restoration specialists who oversee the monitoring and preservation of Monticello's historic architecture. Similarly, UVA employees professionals in their Architect and Facilities offices who oversee the preservation of their OUV related architectural resources.

14.2 - Define which topics are covered by this example of best practice at the property level

State of Conservation

15. Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise

15.1. Relevance of Periodic Reporting

15.1.1 - Has the Periodic Reporting process improved the understanding of the following?

The World Heritage Convention

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

State Party	Not needed
Site Managers	Not needed
UNESCO World Heritage Centre	Not needed
Advisory Bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM)	Not needed

15.2. Use of Data

15.2.1 - How do the authorities in charge of the property plan to use the data recorded from this cycle of Periodic Reporting?

Update of management plans

Awareness raising

15.2.2 - Comments on use of data from the Cycle of Periodic Reporting

15.3. Timing and resources

15.3.1 - Entities involved in the filling out of this online questionnaire (tick as many boxes as applicable)

Site Manager/Coordinator World Heritage property staff

15.3.2 - Has a gender balanced contribution and participation been considered in the filling out of this questionnaire?

Gender balance has **not been explicitly** considered or implemented in the process.

15.3.3 - Were you given adequate time (i.e. roughly ten months) to gather necessary information and to fill in this questionnaire?

Yes

15.3.4 - Please estimate the time (working hours) needed to complete this questionnaire

8 / 9 / 6 /

15.3.5 - Did you mobilise any additional resources to fill out this questionnaire?

	Additional resources	No	Yes
15.3.5.1	Human resources	✗	
15.3.5.2	Financial resources for organizing consultation meetings/ training	✗	

15.4. Format and content of the Periodic Report

15.4.1 - How accessible was the information required to complete this questionnaire?

Most required information was accessible.

15.4.2 - Was the questionnaire easy to use and clear to understand?

		Very Difficult	Difficult	Easy	Very easy
15.4.2.1	Ease of use of questionnaire			✗	
15.4.2.2	Clarity of questions			✗	

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

15.5. Training and Guidance

15.5.1 - Please rate the level of support in terms of training and guidance from the following entities in completing this questionnaire

UNESCO World Heritage Centre	Fair
UNESCO (other sectors/field offices)	Not applicable
UNESCO National Commission	Not applicable
ICOMOS International	No support
IUCN International	No support
ICCROM international/regional	No support
ICOMOS national/regional	No support
IUCN national/regional	No support

15.5.2 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Reporting questionnaire from the following entities

UNESCO World Heritage Centre	Good
State Party Representative (national Focal Point)	Good
UNESCO other sectors (e.g. field office)	Not applicable
National Commission for UNESCO	Not applicable
ICOMOS International	Not applicable
ICCROM International/regional	Not applicable
ICOMOS national/regional	Not applicable
IUCN national/regional	Not applicable
IUCN International	Not applicable

15.5.3 - Were the online training resources prepared by the World Heritage Centre regarding Periodic Reporting adequate for you to complete this questionnaire?

Yes

15.5.4 - If you found that the online training resources were not adequate, what changes would you like to see implemented?

15.6. Actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

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

No item were proposed for update

15.7. Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise

15.7.1 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise

15.7.2 - Thank you for having filled in all the questions. Please contact your National Focal Point for validation.