

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Luther Memorials in Eisleben and Wittenberg

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Germany

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

783

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996




1.3 - Geographic Information Table



Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
Luther's birthplace, Eisleben , Lutherstraße 16 , Germany	51.527 / 11.55	0	0	0	1996
The house in which Luther died, Eisleben , Andreaskirchplatz 7 , Germany	51.528 / 11.545	0	0	0	1996
Luther Hall, Wittenburg , Collegienstraße 54 , Germany	51.865 / 12.653	?	?	0	1996
Melanchthon's house, Wittenburg , Collegienstraße 60 , Germany	0 / 0	?	?	0	1996
The Town Church, Wittenburg , Church Square , Germany	51.867 / 12.645	?	?	0	1996
The Castle Church, Wittenburg , Schloßstraße , Germany	51.866 / 12.639	?	?	0	1996
Total (ha)			0		

Comment

Luther's Birthplace, Eisleben: Coordinates 51.526939,11.550085 "The house in which Luther died" is now called "Luther's Death House". "Luther Hall Wittenburg" must be called "Luther House Wittenberg" "Melanchthon's House Wittenburg" must be called "Melanchthon House Wittenburg", Coordinates 51.864776,12.651062 "The Town Church Wittenburg" must be called "The Town Church Wittenberg" "The Castle Church Wittenburg" must be called "The Castle Church Wittenberg"

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Luther Memorials in Eisleben and Wittenberg - Map showing Luther's birthplace and its buffer zone	18/10/1995	
Luther Memorials in Eisleben and Wittenberg - Map showing the house in which Luther died and its buffer zone	18/10/1995	
Luther Memorials in Eisleben and Wittenberg - Map showing the Luther Hall and Melanchton's house and their buffer zone	18/10/1995	

Luther Memorials in Eisleben and Wittenberg - Map showing the Town Church and its buffer zone	18/10/1995	
Luther Memorials in Eisleben and Wittenberg - Map showing the Castle Church and its buffer zone	18/10/1995	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Birgitta Ringbeck
Auswärtiges Amt
National World Heritage Focal Point
Referat 603-9
Multilaterale Kultur- und Medienpolitik

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Martin Treu
Luther Memorials Foundation of Saxony-Anhalt

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
- [Luthergedenkstätten in Eisleben und Wittenberg \(Deutsche UNESCO- Kommission\)\(german only\)](#)
- [UNESCO Commission of Germany](#)

Comment

<http://www.martinluther.de/en.html>

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

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Comment

submitted for evaluation by 1 February 2012

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

(iv)(vi)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

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

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

3. Factors Affecting the Property

3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact				Origin	
3.1	Buildings and Development						
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities						
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community						
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation						
3.13	Management and institutional factors						
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities						
3.13.2	High impact research / monitoring activities						
3.13.3	Management activities						
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside	

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

No factor is both current and negative.

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 OUV could be improved by an extension with following authentic sites of the life and work of Martin Luther: Eisleben: Churches St Petri, St Pauli, St. Andreas, Monastery St Annen; Wittenberg: Castle, Collegium Augusteum, Bugenhagen-House, Cranach-Houses; Mansfeld: parental home of Luther, Church St George; Torgau: Castle, Castle Church; Coburg: Veste Coburg, Erfurt: Augustinian cloister

4.2. Protective Measures

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

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Tuesday, October 18, 2005

- **Question 6.02**

Land Saxony-Anhalt Law on the Protection of Monuments of 1991, last amended on 17 December 2003 (Land Saxony-Anhalt Gazette of Laws and Ordinances (GVBl),

page 352)

The law gives detailed description of the protection of monuments as Land law.

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

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

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

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

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

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

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

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

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

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Tuesday, October 18, 2005

- **Question 5.02**

Stering group or similar management committee has been set up to guide the management of the site

- **Question 5.03**

Set up date: 1998

Function: Interministerial coordination group at Land level which deals with all the needs of the Luther Memorials in its regular meetings. Scientific Advisory Board only for the museums

Mandate: Coordination, scientific advice

Constituted: formal

- **Question 5.05**

Overall management system of the site

- Management under protective legislation

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

After many years of building activities Management Documents shall be submitted during the next years.

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

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

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

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

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

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

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

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

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

Local communities / residents	Good
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Non-existent
Landowners	Good
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Good

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

Local communities directly **participate** in all relevant decisions relating to management, i.e. co-management

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

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

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

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

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

4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report

4.4. Financial and Human Resources

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

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	10%
International donations (NGO´s, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	50%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	10%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	10%
In country donations (NGO´s, foundations, etc)	10%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	10%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	0%

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

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

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

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

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

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

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

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

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

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

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

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

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

Full-time	80%
Part-time	20%

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

Permanent	60%
Seasonal	40%

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

Paid	90%
Volunteer	10%

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage

property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient**

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 widely** with the local, national and international audiences

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

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

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

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

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

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

Local communities / residents	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Excellent
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Excellent
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Excellent

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

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

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 been an **important influence** on education, information and awareness building activities

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

There is **excellent presentation and interpretation** of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property

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	Excellent
Site museum	Excellent
Information booths	Excellent
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Excellent
Information materials	Excellent
Transportation facilities	Excellent
Other	Excellent

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

4.7. Visitor Management

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

Last year	Minor Increase
Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Minor Increase
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
Transportation services
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys
Other

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

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

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is **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

4.8. Monitoring

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Implementation is **complete**

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

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

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

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

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

No factor is both current and negative.

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	Development of a nomination dossier for extension of the site by authentic sites demonstrating the work and life of Martin Luther	2016/2017	Federal States of Saxony-Anhalt, Saxony and Thuringia	none
4.3 Management System / Management Plan					
4.3.10	There is little or no contact with industry regarding management	none	not defined	none	contact with industry is not relevant for the management of the site

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

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

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

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

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

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

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

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

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

5.4.1 - Comments

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

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

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

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

none

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
Local community
Advisory bodies

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

no

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

none

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

UNESCO	Very poor
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

Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

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

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

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

- **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**
Reason for update: submitted for evaluation by 1 February 2012
- **Geographic Information Table**
Reason for update: Luther's Birthplace, Eisleben: Coordinates 51.526939,11.550085 "The house in which Luther died" is now called "Luther's Death House". "Luther Hall Wittenberg" must be called "Luther House Wittenberg" "Melanchthon's House Wittenberg" must be called "Melanchthon House Wittenberg", Coordinates 51.864776,12.651062 "The Town Church Wittenberg" must be called "The Town Church Wittenberg" "The Castle Church Wittenberg" must be called "The Castle Church Wittenberg"

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

none