

## 1. World Heritage Property Data

### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Litomyšl Castle

### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

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

- Czech Republic

#### Type of Property

cultural

#### Identification Number

901

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

1999


### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Litomyšl Castle	49.874 / 16.314	4.4	94.9	99.3	1999
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>4.4</b>	<b>94.9</b>	<b>99.3</b>	

#### Comment

Coordinates (longitude / latitude): 16°18' 51.984' E / 49° 52'24.996' N Property (ha): 4.25 ha Buffer zone (ha): 115.8 ha Total (ha): 120.05 ha

### 1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Litomyšl Castle - map of inscribed property	04/12/1999	

### 1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Michal Benes  
Ministry of Culture  
Deputy Director General, Section for Cultural Policy and European Funds, Head of Unit for UNESCO

#### Comment

Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic, Dita Limová  
Departement of International Relations, UNESCO Division  
Maltézské nám. 1 118 01 Praha 1 Czech Republic Telephone:  
+420 257 085 371 Fax: +420 725 001 305 Email:  
dita.limova@mkcr.cz National focal point: National Heritage  
Institute, General Directorate, Jitka Vlčková Valdštejnské nám.  
3/162 118 01 Praha 1 - Malá Strana Czech Republic  
Telephone: +420 257 010 115 Fax: +420 257 010 149 E mail:  
vlckova.jitka@npu.cz

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

- Eliška Racková  
National Heritage Institute, Regional Office in Pardubice  
Responsible for annual reporting

#### Comment

An employee of the National Heritage Institute is responsible for the periodic reporting. No manager/coordinator of the entire property has been appointed. The castle manager is an employee of the National Heritage Institute. Contact details are as follows: Zdeňka Kalová, DiS., Tel.: +420 461 615 067, Email: kalova.zdena@npu.cz. The email address of Mrs. E. Racková is changed, the new one is: rackova.eliska@npu.cz.

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

1. [Litomyšl](http://Litomyšl)
2. [www.litomysl.cz/zamek/](http://www.litomysl.cz/zamek/)

#### Comment

<http://www.zamek-litomysl.cz/>

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

#### Comment

Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict; Protocol to the Hague Convention of 1954 for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict; Second Protocol to the Hague Convention; Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage; Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe; European Convention on the Protection of the Archeological Heritage; European Landscape Convention

## 2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

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

#### Comment

The statement is under the review of advisory bodies and State Party.

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

(ii)(iv)

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

(ii) architectural arrangement of the castle building with arcaded courtyard; castle structure with Renaissance details, elements and decorations; disposition of the French garden and the brewery; (iv) castle structure with its decorations; spatial layout and communication pattern; valuable ensemble of outbuildings of high architectural quality; archaeological heritage, gardens, services; spatial relationship with the associated built context of the castle hill and the town structure

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

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

## 3. Factors Affecting the Property

### 3.14. Other factor(s)

#### 3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact						Origin
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>							
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure							
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities							
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>							
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure							
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure							
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>							
3.4.3	Surface water pollution							
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>							
3.7.1	Wind							
3.7.2	Relative humidity							
3.7.4	Radiation/light							
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)							
3.7.7	Pests							
3.7.8	Micro-organisms							
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>							
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses							
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage							
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community							
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation							
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>							
3.10.1	Storms							
3.10.2	Flooding							
3.10.3	Drought							
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>							
3.11.2	Earthquake							
3.11.4	Avalanche/ landslide							
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)							
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>							
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities							
3.13.2	High impact research / monitoring activities							
3.13.3	Management activities							
<b>Legend</b>	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside		

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>					
<b>3.2.4</b>	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	restricted	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>					
<b>3.4.3</b>	Surface water pollution	localised	on-going	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>					
<b>3.7.1</b>	Wind	localised	on-going	significant	low capacity	static

		Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.7.2	Relative humidity	restricted	on-going	significant	medium capacity	decreasing
3.7.4	Radiation/light	localised	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	static
3.7.7	Pests	restricted	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	decreasing
3.7.8	Micro-organisms	restricted	on-going	minor	low capacity	static
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.1	Storms	extensive	one off or rare	significant	high capacity	static
3.13	Management and institutional factors					
3.13.2	High impact research / monitoring activities	localised	one off or rare	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.13.3	Management activities	localised	one off or rare	significant	low capacity	increasing

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

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

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

### 4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

#### 4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The ongoing archaeological research brings new information about the original extent of a settlement which preceded the Renaissance castle. A close evaluation will be necessary to decide whether this entire archaeological site should become part of the World Heritage property and whether it should also include the original parts of the castle compound that are not part of the WH property.

## 4.2. Protective Measures

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

Individual properties in the Litomyšl Castle ensemble are protected under Law No 20 on state conservation of the cultural heritage (1987). The whole ensemble is registered as national cultural heritage by Government Resolution No 251/1962. The ensemble forms part of the urban conservation area of Litomyšl, which covers the historic centre of the town (including the castle), as defined in Ministry of Culture Decree

No 16417/97-VI/1. All of these measures ensure that all interventions must be authorized by the competent institutions at central and local government level.

The draft of a new Law on National Heritage Conservation which should replace the existing Act No. 20 of 1987 Coll. has been finalized by the Czech Ministry of Culture. This proposal takes in account the World Heritage and defines principles and mechanisms in relation to it.

On 20 July 2011 the government of the Czech Republic approved the "Concept of monument care in the Czech Republic for 2011-2016". The concept is based on a joint general conceptual material of the resort called "State Culture Policy", and it also follows up on conceptual materials about protection of other elements of cultural heritage, i.e. the "Concept of more effective care of movable cultural heritage in the Czech Republic for 2010-2014", which was acknowledged by the government of the Czech Republic on 1 December 2010, and the "Concept of more effective care of traditional folk culture in the Czech Republic for 2011 – 2015", which was approved by the government of the Czech Republic on 5 January 2011.

The material is divided into two main parts. Firstly, it analyzes outputs of monument care in the previous years and in the second part it proposes relevant precautions. The proposal part stresses mainly the necessity for legislative changes in the monument care domain, putting great emphasis on improving the descriptive qualities of the Central Register of Cultural Monuments established by the law and simplifying and improving the quality of performance of the public administration in monument care sector. The concept reflects the current trends of electronization of state administration and digitization of analogue data, including documentation registers.

#### Comment

Decree of the Ministry of Culture No. 420/2008 Coll. stipulating the essential elements and content of the heritage reservation and heritage zone protection plans; Act No. 183/2006 Coll., on Land Use Planning and on the Building Procedure Code; Decree of the Ministry of Regional Development No. 500/2006 Coll., on supporting analytical zoning data, zoning documentation and zoning records

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

An adequate legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are **some deficiencies in implementation**

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

An adequate legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are **some deficiencies in implementation**

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

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides **an adequate**

or better basis for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

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

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

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

To date, the Convention on the Protection of the World Heritage has not been fully implemented by the Heritage Act currently in force. In most respects, the current law provides sufficient instruments to govern the use of the WH property based on its status as a national cultural heritage site (NCHS) and part of UCA; however, it does not provide an adequate legal framework for management and other elements of the administration of a WH site following from the Operational Guidelines.

**4.3. Management System / Management Plan**

**4.3.1 - Management System**

The castle is in public ownership. It was state property until 1995, when part of the ensemble was transferred to the municipality of Litomyšl. At the present time, therefore, ownership of the castle, Lord's House, coach-house, saletta, second and third courtyards, garden, and park is vested in the Conservation Institute at Pardubice, whilst the brewery, the riding school, the stable, the small house, and the first courtyard are owned by the municipality.

Management of their respective properties is in the hands of these two bodies. Overall supervision of conservation is exercised by the Conservation Department of the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic and by the State Institute for the Care of Historical Monuments.

**Comment**

At present, the property as a whole does not have a Management Plan (MP) or any other relevant planning tool. Directives for the management of a part of the property are determined by the Castle Hill Revitalization project for a period of at least five years after its completion. Any structural alterations and changes of use are subject to the issuance of the relevant permit.

**4.3.2 - Management Documents**

**Comment**

There is no management plan or other management document. Important documents in relation to the property management are as follows: The project of the Castle Hill Revitalization. 2007-2013. Strategic Development Plan of the City of Litomyšl for the Period 2008-2015. Land Use Plan of the City of Litomyšl. 2011.

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

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

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

The management system / plan is **not adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

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

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

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

**No annual work / action plan** exists

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

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

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

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

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

Indigenous peoples have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role

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

There is contact but only **some cooperation** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

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

The responsibility for the property management is divided between two entities - the National Heritage Institute (NHI) and the City of Litomyšl. At present, the City of Litomyšl implements a project of the Castle Hill Revitalization which, in addition to physical changes, will also bring changes in the management (the establishment of the Zámecké návrší o.p.s., the Castle Hill Public Benefit Corporation). The preparation of the Management Plan is extremely important for further development.

**4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective**

**measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report**

The management of the buildings of the City of Litomyšl takes place in line with the Castle Hill Revitalization project (in the past periodic report, it was under consideration and still included the buildings managed by the NHI). The project also includes some buildings managed by the NHI that were lent to the City of Litomyšl for the period of project implementation and monitoring. The project was supposed to include almost the entire property.

**4.4. Financial and Human Resources**

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

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	67%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	17%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	9%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	7%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	0%

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

**Comment**

The World Heritage property has not received any Assistance from the World Heritage Fund.

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

The available budget is **inadequate** for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage

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

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

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

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

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

There are **some** adequate equipment and facilities, but deficiencies in at least one key area **constrain** management at the World Heritage property

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

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

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

The situation of the individual parts of the property varies significantly. The funding of the conservation of the castle building (the main bearer of the OUV) is the most critical. The last report defined the amount of funding as an covering the essential needs and insufficient for the necessary major repairs. Since this report, the budget for conservation was reduced by 75%. 4.4.1 due to large investment (85% ERDF - conservation of the outbuildings), this period can not be considered typical.

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

Full-time	100%
Part-time	0%

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

Permanent	75%
Seasonal	25%

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

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

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

Human resources are **inadequate** for management needs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

None of the answers provided above reflects the situation in Litomyšl. The advantage of Litomyšl is the presence of the Faculty of Restoration of the Pardubice University which offers the possibility of close long-term cooperation. There is no need to plan to develop the know-how.

**4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects**

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

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for most key areas **but there are gaps**

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

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

**4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?**

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

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

SLAVÍK, J. The Renaissance Castle in Litomyšl. In Svorník 6/2008, Praha 2008. SKŘIVÁNEK, M. Litomyšl 1259-2009. The City of Culture and Education. Litomyšl 2009. KŘÍŽOVÁ, K. The Litomyšl Castle. In The Heritage Preservation Newsletter 69, 2009. WAISSER, P. (ed.). Litomyšl Castle sgraffitoes. Litomyšl 2011. BLÁHA, J. The Castle Theatre in Litomyšl, Nymburk 2010.

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

As regards 4.5.2, none of the provided answers reflects the situation in the research of the property. The research is not based on a research plan but it is aimed at providing for the needs of property management and improving the understanding of the OUV. Every year, a certain volume of research takes place, however, this volume should be increased.

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

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

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

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

Local communities / residents	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Average
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Average
Local businesses and industries	Average

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

There is a **limited and ad hoc** education and awareness programme

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

See 5.2

**4.7. Visitor Management**

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

Last year	Decreasing
Two years ago	Minor Increase

Three years ago	Decreasing
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Minor Increase

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

Entry tickets and registries
Accommodation establishments

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**Comment**

The situation in the number of visitors does not require the preparation of documents on visitor management.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The current number of visitors does not have a negative impact on the OUV; on the contrary, a slight increase is desirable. The property benefits from a steady growth of other than purely visitor use. From the underfunded castle, support is expected of cultural and educational activities held in the castle in the form of highly discounted rental fees. The earnings of the castle are redistributed within the NHI's building management system and a portion is used to support other valuable heritage.

**4.8. Monitoring**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**No relevant** Committee recommendations to implement

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

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

It is desirable to extend the monitoring to include other key indicators for which it is necessary to gather more input data. New key indicators are introduced gradually.

**4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs**

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

Please refer to question 5.2



5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

	World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>						
3.7.1	<b>Wind</b>	(ii), (iv) Architectural elements, details and decoration - stonework elements and sgraffito decoration of the facade	In 2011, a survey of the castle facades carried out. In 2012, endangered parts of the facades in the second courtyard and the brewery tower secured. In 2013, emergency treatment on the north and east facade. General conservation is planned.	The condition of the facades is closely monitored as a separate key indicator.	The sgraffitoes of the brewery tower are planned be restored in 2014. General conservation of the castle facades will begin in 2014.	National Heritage Institute The City of Litomyšl	Prevailing wind direction is the main factor that determines the degree of exposure to other related climatic factors (water, acid rain, microorganisms) and which determines the degree of damage to the facades.
3.7.2	<b>Relative humidity</b>	(iv) Theatrical sceneries	To provide an adequate depository of theatrical sceneries and to carry out their emergency treatment, followed by their general conservation.	The condition of the sceneries is checked regularly and major changes are reflected in an Annual Monitoring Report.	N/A	National Heritage Institute	The sceneries were moved from a highly unsuitable storage area to different premises. These are not entirely satisfactory (poor environmental control, presentation of the unique ensemble is impossible). The condition of the sceneries is quite poor.
3.7.6	<b>Water (rain/water table)</b>	(ii), (iv) Architectural elements, details and decoration - sgraffito facades, complicated authentic roof structure	Continuous replacement of past-service-life parts and small repairs Overhaul of the roof as well as of the gutter system	Checks are carried out in the scope of regular maintenance. Major defects and their consequences are reflected in an annual monitoring report.	N/A	Territorial Heritage Administration (THA) of the National Heritage Institute	The overdue service life of the roof coating and gutters is extended by makeshift repairs - the incidence of leaks increases and first local wood-borer attacks appear. Gutter failures may cause serious damage to the sgraffito facades.
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>						
3.8.1	<b>Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses</b>	(ii) Architectural arrangement of the castle building with an arcaded courtyard Castle structure including Renaissance architectural details, elements and decorations	To identify and implement a solution to the organisation of the Smetana's Litomyšl Festival that would be acceptable to all parties in terms of the functioning of the castle and of the protection of the attributes from negative effects.	Annual reports have emphasized the negative effects associated with the current organization festival since 2008: damage to the sgraffito decoration by water splashes from temporary roof construction, inappropriate OUV presentation.	N/A	National Heritage Institute; Smetana's Litomyšl Public Benefit Corporation	The Smetana's Litomyšl Festival is an important event of international importance which is traditionally associated with the castle. The event constrains the functioning of the castle and requires a roof mounted over the entire arcade courtyard.
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>						
3.13.2	<b>High impact research / monitoring activities</b>	(iv) Archaeological fields and authentic archaeological context, torso architecture under the ground	Some ongoing actions have been stopped or modified to reduce their effects. All interventions in archaeological sites cannot be eliminated. A mechanism for assessing future earthworks will be introduced to restrict encroachments in authentic fields.	The state of preservation of archaeological site will be monitored as one of the key indicators on a common basis with the planning of interventions.	2014	National Heritage Institute and the Institute of Archaeology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic	Since 2011, extensive rescue archaeological excavation has been conducted. The site extends over the boundaries of the World Heritage property. The archaeological research has significantly broadened the possibilities of OUV interpretation.

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.13.3	Management activities	(iv) Ensemble of valuable outbuildings of high architectural, technical facilities of the site, authentic archaeological fields, garden design, property environment	The effect of recent modern interventions in the property and its environment should be assessed from a distance. Interventions inside the property (except in archaeological site) are reversible and can be removed without permanent damage to the OUV	The evolution of the project is reflected in annual monitoring reports.	Long-term.	National Heritage Institute, Czech National Committee of ICOMOS	The main objective of the project is to guarantee a sustainable use focused on educational and cultural activities. Opponents including the Czech National Committee of ICOMOS criticise the degree of contrast remodelling included in the project.

## 5.2. Summary - Management Needs

### 5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones							
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.1.2	Boundaries could be improved	Evaluate outcomes of research (extensive research still ongoing) Review the conclusiveness of the arguments and extension options on national level Review the national status of the buildings and areas in question	Research evaluation possible 2014-2015 Decision if other actions should be taken will follow	National Heritage Institute	Ongoing archaeological research resulting from Castle Hill Revitalization and the archival research may give new grounds for WH site extension - some values stated in original nomination and grounded in OUV are situated outside the WH property.		
4.3 Management System / Management Plan							
4.3.4	Management system / plan is inadequate	To prepare a Management Plan. The functioning without a MP is unsatisfactory in terms of the coordination of the management of the compound by two owners.	2014-2015	The City of Litomyšl; the National Heritage Institute	According to the last period report, the preparation of the MP was expected in 2007. The analytic part was finished in 2010. The absence of a long-term strategy of the renovation and presentation of the castle building is also a serious problem.		
4.4 Financial and Human Resources							
4.4.3	The budget is inadequate for management needs	Budget needs and their importance should be better declared through management plan and other planning mechanisms. It is necessary to increase the budget for regular maintenance, continuous minor repairs and restoration works.	Financing for specific most urgent purposes (sgraffito facade renovation) can be expected from 2014. Due to the general economic situation, dramatic budget rises can not be expected in the near future.	National Heritage Institute	The budget for restoration works and maintenance in 2011 amounted to just 15% of the budget at the time of inscription when, however, the intention of further increase was declared in nomination. At present, major restoration works are necessary.		
4.4.12	Human resources inadequate for management needs	NHI was reorganized effective 2013 with expectation of more efficient services for the NHI heritage sites. Zámecké návrší Public Benefit Corporation was established, whose main task will be to ensure the sustainability of the Revitalization project.	The results of the reorganization, personnel changes in the NHI and the establishment of the Zámecké návrší Public Benefit Corporation will become visible in 2013-2014.	National Heritage Institute Zámecké návrší Public Benefit Corporation	In particular in the case of the castle, the current situation only permitted keeping the basic functioning of the property. Changes and enhanced management could become another catalyst of further positive development of the property.		
4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building							
4.6.3	There is a limited education and awareness programme	A wide range of educational activities is being prepared by the City of Litomyšl within the programmes of the Castle Hill Revitalization project; Preparation of a permanent OUV focused exhibition; Presentation of the archaeological heritage.	The expected completion date of the Castle Hill Revitalization programme is 2014. In 2014, exposition on archaeological heritage will be opened in the Regional Museum.	City of Litomyšl National Heritage Institute Litomyšl Regional Museum	The ongoing extensive archaeological research will significantly broaden the presentation options of the archaeological heritage. In addition to exhibitions and information boards, some major findings will be presented in situ.		

**5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property**

**5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity**

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

**5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity**

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

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

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

**5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values**

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

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

**5.4.1 - Comments**

Permanent underfunding of maintenance and conservation works results in a slow deterioration of a part of the compound. In the late period, the state of conservation was affected by the implementation of the Castle Hill Revitalization project: the main objective is to ensure sustainable use including the presentation of the property's OUV. The project also has some less positive aspects.

**6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise**

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

Conservation	Positive
Research and monitoring	Positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	No impact
Political support for conservation	Very positive
Legal / Policy framework	No impact
Lobbying	Positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	No impact
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

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

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

Governmental institution responsible for the property
---

Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
External experts
Others

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

yes

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

The factors and management needs are often very general or it is difficult to relate the provided alternatives to one of the provided items. I would welcome the opportunity to fill in a short explanatory box manually. The automatic selection of issues to be elaborated in sections 5.1 and 5.2 does not correspond with the real priorities.

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

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Good

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

Most of the required information was accessible

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

The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting

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

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

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

- **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**  
 Reason for update: The statement is under the review of advisory bodies and State Party.
- **Geographic Information Table**  
 Reason for update: Coordinates (longitude / latitude): 16°18' 51.984' E / 49° 52'24.996' N Property (ha): 4.25 ha Buffer zone (ha): 115.8 ha Total (ha): 120.05 ha

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