

Porcal-Gonzalo, María C. (2023). *Exploring the heritage dimension of vineyard landscapes based on a critical approach to their inscription on the World Heritage List*, **International Journal of Heritage Studies**, 29(7), 643-663. This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in **International Journal of Heritage Studies** on 11 May 2023, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2023.2211986>

## **Exploring the heritage dimension of vineyard landscapes based on a critical approach to their inscription on the World Heritage List**

María C. Porcal-Gonzalo

Department of Geography, Prehistory, and Archaeology, University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU)  
Vitoria-Gasteiz, Spain

**Abstract.** Vineyard landscapes are an excellent example of cultural landscapes that represent the interactions between nature and culture, providing many of them with a unique heritage value. This study takes a critical approach to the nomination processes of World Heritage vineyard landscapes, focusing on the practical application of the eligibility criteria and the key concepts of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), authenticity and integrity. A detailed comparative study of the nine specific vineyard cultural landscapes included in the World Heritage List has been conducted based on three primary sources: the Nomination Files, the Advisory Bodies Evaluations and the minutes of the World Heritage Committee meetings with the decisions to inscribe or not to inscribe the sites. A systematic analysis of the many recommendations issued by ICOMOS to the States Parties and their comparison with the Committee's decisions has provided insight into the evolution of perspectives. In turn, these have given rise to a discussion regarding several aspects: inscription categories, names and surface areas of the properties, duration of the process, OUV and attributes that embody said value, authenticity and integrity, boundaries and management plans. Thus, this paper will shine a light on the difficult subject of identifying outstanding heritage specificities and linking OUV to the territorial conservation and management of living rural landscapes.

**Keywords:** vineyard landscapes; cultural heritage; UNESCO World Heritage List; Outstanding Universal Value; authenticity; integrity.

Subject classification codes: 5403, 5404

## **1: Introduction**

### ***1.1.: Vineyard landscapes as cultural landscapes and World Heritage Sites***

Vineyard landscapes are a specific and specialised type of agricultural landscape that represents the use of the ecological environment for productive purposes and are illustrative of the social construction of a region over time within the framework of a variety of technical, socio-economic and political contexts. It is, therefore, a humanised, functional and dynamic type of landscape resulting from the hybridisation of nature and culture that fits well with the definition of cultural landscape adopted by UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation) following the recognition of this concept in 1992. According to this international organisation, cultural landscapes represent 'the combined works of nature and of man' and 'they are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal' (UNESCO 1994, 13). At the same time, vineyard landscapes stand out for their diversity, the result of the heterogeneous nature of the ecological environment and the historical-cultural framework in which they have been built.

Accordingly, in addition to their economic value, many of the vineyard landscapes located in countries with a robust agrarian tradition stand out for their aesthetic values but, above all, for their significance and historical memory and cultural heritage values (e.g. Legouy and Boulanger 2015; Pitte 2009) and for the symbolic and identity value they embody, often manifested in a sense of collective belonging. The cultural and heritage perspective of vineyard landscapes has given rise to numerous scientific studies (e.g. Unwin 2001; Briffaud and Brochot 2010; Cleere 2004; Luginbül 2005; Porcal-Gonzalo 2019) and technical documents (e.g. UNESCO 2001; ICOMOS 2005, 2017).

Moreover, vineyard landscapes have already been recognised as heritage sites at various territorial levels (international, national, regional and local), as evidenced by their strong presence on the WHL (the UNESCO World Heritage List) compared to other types of agricultural landscapes (UNESCO 2022). More specifically, there are 9 inscribed landscapes located in France, Portugal, Italy, Austria and Hungary, and a total of 16, if we add 7 that are of a secondary winemaking nature. France has the highest number of World Heritage vineyard cultural landscapes ('The Jurisdiction de Saint-Emilion', in 1999, 'The Climats, terroirs of Burgundy', in 2015, and 'Champagne Hillsides, Houses and Cellars', also in 2015), followed by Portugal ('Alto Douro Wine Region', in 2001, and 'Landscape of the Pico Island Vineyard Culture', in 2004), Italy ('Vineyard Landscape of Piedmont: Langhe-Roero and Monferrato', in 2014, and 'Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene', in 2019), Hungary ('Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape', in 2002) and Switzerland ('Lavaux, vineyard terraces', in 2007)<sup>1</sup>. In addition, the 7 cultural landscapes that also have a strong winegrowing character - albeit combined with other outstanding heritage elements - are 'Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the Islands Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto', 'Costiera Amalfitana' and 'Val d'Orcia' (in Italy, the former two were inscribed on the WHL in 1997 and the latter in 2004), 'The Loire Valley between Sully-sur-Loire and Chalonnes' (France, 2000), 'Wachau Cultural Landscape' (Austria, 2000), 'Ferto/Neusiedlersee' (Hungary, 2001) and 'Upper Middle Rhine Valley' (Germany, 2002).

Their territorial distribution reflects that they are all concentrated in ancient European wine-producing countries, at varying latitudes and in different climatic zones (Mediterranean, Atlantic, continental and transitional). In addition, there are the vine and wine-related

---

<sup>1</sup> To simplify the designations of these nine cultural landscapes, they will be referred to as follows throughout the paper: Saint-Emilion, Burgundy, Champagne, Alto Douro, Pico Island, Piedmont, Le Colline del Prosecco, Tokaj and Lavaux.

nominations on UNESCO's Tentative List. (e.g. 'The Ribeira Sacra, Lugo and Orense', 'La Rioja and Rioja Alavesa Vine and Wine Cultural Landscape' and 'Priorat-Monstsant-Siurana. Paysaje agricole de la Montagne mediterrannée', in Spain).

## ***1.2. UNESCO requirements for a cultural landscape to be inscribed on its World Heritage List: some preliminary considerations***

The inclusion of a property in the WHL requires compliance with the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (hereinafter Convention), which constitutes the fundamental framework of the World Heritage system and the main purpose of which is to ensure the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage of OUV (Outstanding Universal Value) (UNESCO 1972). According to the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (hereinafter, Operational Guidelines), OUV — which is the key concept — 'means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity' (paragraph 49). To qualify, the property must meet one or more of the ten World Heritage criteria, satisfy the conditions of integrity and authenticity, and have a protection and management system in place that guarantees the safeguarding of the values and sets an example for other territories<sup>2</sup>. Until

---

<sup>2</sup> The criteria traditionally applied to cultural heritage have been the following: (i) represent a masterpiece of human creative genius; (ii) exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design; (iii) bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared; (iv) be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history; (v) be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially

2003, criteria (i) to (vi) applied to cultural heritage and (vii) to (x) applied to natural heritage. However, the 6th extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee (WHC) decided to merge the ten criteria (Decision 6 EXT.COM 5.1<sup>3</sup>), which was a major step in furthering a holistic approach to heritage.

The strength of the arguments justifying that the property meets the above criteria is crucial for approving a proposal for inscription on the WHL. It is also essential to identify and describe unambiguously the tangible or intangible attributes that serve as the basis for its OUV. The main challenge is to build a narrative that shows that the loss of the OUV of a landscape would represent an irreparable loss for humanity as a whole.

In turn, the WHL inscription process has to follow certain steps established by UNESCO in the Operational Guidelines, chap. III (UNESCO, 2021). To evaluate the nominations and to monitor the conservation status of the properties inscribed, the WHC is advised by the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) and the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM).

### ***1.3. Critical framework on heritage creation and WHL inscription processes and a scientific discussion on the heritagization of cultural landscapes.***

The critical discussion on heritage creation has gained momentum since the 1980s and 1990s, developing in various scientific disciplines belonging mainly to the Social Sciences and Humanities, including anthropology, archaeology, geopolitics and cultural geography. The critical heritage studies primarily explore the relationship between society and heritage (Waterton and Smith 2010; Harrison 2013) and emphasise cultural heritage as a political,

---

when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change; (vi) be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance.

<sup>3</sup> Decision 6 EXT.COM 5.1. <https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2003/whc03-6extcom-conf08e.pdf>

cultural, and social phenomenon (Gentry and Smith, 2019).

Within this framework, the critical discussion on World Heritage and the nomination process to the WHL has also broadened. An excellent example of this approach can be found in Smith's remarks (Smith 2006, 99): 'The World heritage List itself is a process of meaning making –it is a list that not only identifies, but also defines, which heritage places are globally important. The listing process creates o recreates sites as universally important and meaningful. Once again, the process of listing is an act of heritage management that is itself an act of heritage in which, on this occasion, a sense of universal human identity is created'.

By way of summary, the following key issues have been identified in critical World Heritage studies: 1) The markedly Western perspective regarding the definition of World Heritage (Harvey 2001; Di Giovine 2009; Silverman, 2010) and the imposition of its values, restoration policies and dominant historical narratives (Arroyo 2021; Labadi 2007); 2) The subjectivity in the interpretation of the OUV and the vagueness of the criteria for justifying universality (Cleere 2001; Smith 2006; Tucker and Carnegie 2014); 3) The emphasis on the scientific, aesthetic, material, and physical nature of heritage (Baird 2009); 4) A certain tendency to romanticize communities and their relationship with the land in the ICOMOS evaluations and the 'statements of OUV' adopted by the WHC (Brumman 2015); 5) The lack of transparency in the inscription procedure of a property on the WHL, its bureaucratic nature, mediated by diplomatic negotiations, exchange of votes and alliance-building, and the politicisation of the final decisions taken by the WHC (Cameron 2009; Harrison 2013; Adell et al. 2015; Di Giovine 2017; Wiktor-Mach 2019); 6) The increase in approvals by the WHC that contradict the recommendations of the advisory bodies (Cameron 2009); 7) The strong influence of countries' borders in the nomination and definition of properties, aided by the fact that nominations are made by states; 8) The limited actual participation of local communities in the nomination process (Labadi 2007; Adell et al. 2015; Brumann 2015) ; 9)

The dominant Eurocentrism in the geographical distribution of properties inscribed on the WHL and the under-representation of the heritage of indigenous peoples (Cleere 2001; Fowler 2003; Smith 2006; Baird 2009); 10) The disproportionately represents cultural and natural heritage properties (Baird 2009).

Because of their complexity, heritage landscapes have been the subject of multidisciplinary scientific research, in some cases from a critical perspective (Pettenati 2022; Baird 2009). In this context, the evolution of concepts such as space, culture, and landscape in the field of cultural geography is meaningful (Claval 2022; Cosgrove 1998), as well as the identification of the close relationships between the senses of place, time and heritage (Ashworth 2017). In contrast to the predominance of material elements, the meanings and values of a landscape have taken centre stage in landscape studies (Penning-Rowsell 1986). However, as Harvey and Waterton (2015) point out, the conflation of the terms landscape and heritage has been accepted rather too comfortably without exploring the tensions and opportunities that derive from such a pairing. The ‘heritage dissonance’ concept has contributed to this discussion, enriching it (Ashworth and Tunbridge 1996; Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge 2016).

The scientific debate on the heritagization process of properties in general, and of wine-growing landscapes in particular, has revealed that these are not neutral processes devoid of practical consequences but are often driven by political and economic interests and lead to varying effects, especially at the local level (Penning-Rowsell 1986). As is the case with landscapes, heritagization represents a process of cultural construction, dynamic over time and generally complex, involving various contexts (social, ideological, economic, political, etc.) and agents which, depending on their specific spatial and temporal coordinates, will display preferences for certain landscapes and heritagization arguments (Porcal-Gonzalo 2019, 231). This situation implies the assumption that the identification of heritage landscapes

and their specific meanings and values are subject to interpretations, which convey different messages. Heritage policies and practices require discourses that strengthen the value and authenticity of the landscape, usually based on historical and tradition-preserving arguments. Thus, the past legitimises the aspirations of the present, sometimes by promoting forgetfulness or memory creation and, ultimately, by inventing traditions (Hobsbawn 1983).

Wine-growing landscapes are ‘evolving and living cultural landscapes’ that have two main disadvantages in terms of their heritagization and conservation: firstly, their lack of monumentality and magnificence compared to other types of landscapes, and secondly, their significance in terms of production. However, vineyards often remain on the land for many years, and they are often passed down from one family generation to the next, which fits in well with the idea of continuity over time and attachment to the past, which Lowenthal (1985, 1998) underlines as one of the main reasons for heritage activation. The disruption of this ‘continuity’ caused by the attempt to freeze the landscape in time is probably the greatest risk of applying conservation and preservation protocols to this type of property, given that it causes the opposite effect to what it is intended to protect: the loss of heritage values and not their safeguarding. A good example of this is the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras landscape inscribed on the WHL in 1995 (Baird 2009, 2-4). On the other hand, the recognition of some vineyard landscapes as world heritage sites, and their consequent change of status, has led to their international exposure and promotion as tourist destinations. The commodification of heritage and heritage landscapes has been widely criticised (Waite 2000) and the problems of coexistence of wine-making with mass tourism have been highlighted in some cultural landscapes in the WHL (Di Giovine 2009; Paradiso 2022).

#### ***1.4. Research aim***

Since 1992, cultural landscapes have gradually been added to the WHL, reaching 120 properties in 65 countries in 2022 (which account for 13.38% of all cultural sites and 10.40%



of all properties on the List). However, in recent years, problematic conceptual and practical issues related to this heritage category have been highlighted.

This paper follows the line of recent studies that, from a critical perspective, analyse the discourse developed by authorising institutions of heritage (including UNESCO and ICOMOS) in defining ‘what heritage is, how and why it is significant, and how it should be managed and use’ (Smith 2006, 87). More specifically, the goal is to unravel this discourse through a critical approach to the inscription process of vineyard landscapes on the WHL. This goal implies, for example, examining concepts such as OUV, authenticity, integrity, and cultural significance, which are often assumed ‘uncritically’, remain vague and undefined (Fowler 2003; Stovel 2007; Landorf 2009; Gullino and Larcher 2013) and applied to entirely different kinds of properties. As Gullino and Larcher (2013, 390) point out – referring to the concept of integrity – ‘no roadmap exists on how to evaluate integrity, or if it is even possible to look at integrity in rural landscapes’.

The main goal of this paper is broken down into four specific goals. Firstly, to analyse the heritage recognition procedure followed by UNESCO through a detailed comparative study of vineyard landscapes. Secondly, to reflect critically on essential concepts (OUV, integrity and authenticity) and their practical application in the context of UNESCO. Thirdly, to identify the permanence and changes in the heritage discourse between 1992 and 2022. Finally, to contribute to providing keys to identify the heritage value of particularly complex cultural properties, such as living rural landscapes that maintain their agrarian function and, within them, vineyard landscapes. This landscape subtype has been chosen as the focus of study because of its long historical tradition but also because of the significant number of examples on the WHL over the years, making it easier to analyze the evolution of the ideas advocated regarding the value and meaning of specific heritage landscapes.

The critical approach of this paper has two purposes: first, to examine the nomination process for vineyard landscapes on the List by asking questions that contribute to understanding how UNESCO's discourse of heritage is constructed; second, to highlight contradictions, frictions and key issues related to the heritagization of wine-growing landscapes. These considerations have been made from the point of view of a discipline that is more alien than others to heritage studies, namely geography, but which has a long history in the analysis of cultural landscapes (and which, above all, underlines the importance of approaching the landscape in an integrated way as a whole, highlighting the interactions between heritage, territory and sense of place).

## **2: Materials and methods**

Two main methodological approaches have been followed to achieve the stated goals. First, the review of the specialised literature on the subject produced by the international scientific community and the examination of the main UNESCO World Heritage reference documents. Secondly, the detailed analysis of the declaration procedure for each of the nine specific winegrowing areas included in the WHL under the cultural landscapes category, from their nomination and inclusion in the Tentative List to their final approval by the WHC. This approach has taken the form of a comparative study using three primary sources: on the one hand, the Nomination Files submitted by the States Parties, on the other hand, the Advisory Bodies Evaluations – which are not binding, but mandatory for the examination of the nomination by the WHC – and, finally, the summarised minutes of the WHC meetings with the decisions taken on the inscription of properties on the WHL (see Table 1). The former have made it possible, above all, to identify the specificity of each landscape, their most outstanding heritage values and cultural significance. The latter have made it possible to understand how ICOMOS and the WHC understand aspects such as the OUV, the authenticity, the integrity and the protection and management of heritage properties and, in

short, how the World Heritage Convention is applied and how their approach has evolved.

While Nomination Files have been used as sources in other studies, there have been fewer systematic analyses of the Evaluation Reports issued by the advisory bodies, which is why — in our view — they are a major contribution of this paper. It has been noted that — at the request of the WHC — the ICOMOS evaluation reports have become more detailed and extensive since 2004. Since then, they are organised into 8 main sections with a cartographic and photographic appendix: Basic data (official name, location, brief description, category of property and stages of the process); The property (description, history and development); Justification for inscription, integrity and authenticity; Factors affecting the property; Protection, conservation and management; Monitoring; Conclusions and Recommendations. In many cases, the assessments, comments and recommendations are highly detailed and provide a good starting point for critical reflection. Furthermore, the study of properties approved prior to 2005 has also required reference to the Adoption of Retrospective Statements of OUV.

The traceability of the nomination processes to the WHL has been made possible thanks to the free access, through the Internet, to the main documents generated.

[Table 1 near here]

### **3: Results: Analysis of vineyard landscapes included in the WHL**

#### ***3.1. When? Under which category? How extensive? And how long did the inscription process take?***

The recognition of vineyard landscapes as World Heritage Sites is relatively recent, dating from the last twenty-two years. The first to be inscribed on the WHL was Saint-Emilion, in 1999, and the last was Le Colline del Prosecco, in 2019. Previously, in 1997, the inscription of two spectacular Italian landscapes had been approved: Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the

Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto) and Costa Amalfitana. Both feature extremely interesting historical vineyard systems adapted to steep hillsides; however, their inscription on the WHL was not based exclusively or primarily on these systems, which is why they have been excluded from the comparative study in this paper. Between 1999 and 2019, there has been an uneven trend in the number of vineyard landscapes inscribed, with a five-year hiatus during which no nominations were accepted (2008-2013) and one year, 2015, in which there were two nominations from the same country (France).

The nine inscribed properties have been added to the WHL as *sites*, in terms of the categories of cultural property set out in Article 1 of the 1972 Convention, and as *cultural landscapes*, in terms of the definition in the Operational Guidelines (as revised periodically since 1994). Likewise, within cultural landscapes, they belong to the category of 'organically evolved landscapes' and to the 'continuing landscape' sub-category, which means that they reflect the process of evolution in their form and component features and, in turn, that the evolutionary process is still in progress (Operational Guidelines, 2021, paragraph 47 bis (ii), p. 23). In addition, some of them — e.g. Piedmont, Burgundy and Champagne — have been inscribed on the WHL as serial properties, meaning they 'include two or more component parts related by clearly defined links' (Operational Guidelines, 2021, paragraph 137, p. 45). Moreover, only three of the nine nominations use the term landscape to refer to the property ('Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape', 'Landscape of the Pico Island vineyard culture' and 'Vineyard landscape of Piedmont: Langhe-Roero and Monferrato').

The approved area corresponding to the 'property' and the 'buffer zone' varies considerably from one case to another, ranging from 898 hectares and 1,408 hectares respectively in Lavaux to 24,600 hectares and 225,400 hectares in Alto Douro. In terms of the size of the property alone, 3 of the nominations do not exceed 1,200 hectares (Lavaux, Champagne and Pico Island), 4 range from 7,000 to 14,000 hectares (Saint-Emilion,

Burgundy, Piedmont and Tokaj) and 2 exceed 20,000 hectares (Le Colline del Prosecco and Alto Douro). There is no correlation between the size of the property and such aspects as the year of approval of the declaration, the country applying, and the predominance of terraced vineyards (see Table 2).

[Table 2 near here]

The stages and timescales involved in the procedure from the moment the State Party submits the nomination file to the WHC until the WHC makes a decision on whether or not to approve it are set out in the Operational Guidelines and, in the case of the nine vineyard landscapes analysed, the process took around 18 months. However, the disparity between the nominations is greater if we take their prior inclusion on the Tentative List as the starting point<sup>4</sup>: the one-year period that the Lavaux nomination was on the Tentative List before the World Heritage Centre received the file (which is the minimum time required) contrasts sharply with almost 12 years in the case of Champagne, 11 years of Burgundy, and 4.6 years of Piedmont. The extended length of time that some nominations have remained on the Tentative List is due to a variety of reasons: for example, the interest of the nominating countries and regions in moving the process forward, as well as the compromises and possible conflicts that arise.

### ***3.2. What were the values, criteria and arguments put forward in the nominations?***

Since 2005, WHL nominations must include a Statement of OUV, which has resulted in

---

<sup>4</sup> It has only been possible to ascertain the precise date of entry on the Tentative List since 2005, i.e. for Lavaux, Piedmont, The Burgundy, Champagne and Le Colline del Prosecco. Earlier nomination files only provide information on the dates that correspond to the stages following the submission of the file.

earlier nominations being required to prepare Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value. Such has been the case with Saint-Emilion (41COM 8E, 2017), Alto Douro (42COM 8E, 2018), Tokaj (37COM 8E, 2013) and Pico Island (38COM 8E, 2014).

Table 2 lists the criteria used in the nine nominations to justify their OUV. Five of them have based their OUV on two criteria, three nominations on three criteria and one nomination on one. The most frequently repeated criterion is iii (8 times), followed by v (7 times) and iv (4 times). Criterion vi has only been used once as a justification, and not alone but combined with others. In turn, criteria i and ii have been discarded. Therefore, the justifications that stand out are those based on the existence of unique or exceptional evidence of the cultural tradition of producing and trading grapes and wine, often illustrative of a significant historical period, as well as those highlighting the presence of outstanding examples of landscapes, land use, settlements and buildings related to winegrowing and winemaking.

In summary, the main reasons given to demonstrate compliance with the criteria were the following: 1) the age of the winegrowing and winemaking activity, the historical value of the landscape and its exemplary nature (criteria iii and iv); 2) the evolutionary and diachronic nature of the landscape and the maintenance of a winegrowing and winemaking tradition still alive today (criteria iii and v); 3) the vestiges of a territorial organisation geared to wine production, reflecting the interaction between society and nature and, in particular, human adaptation to ecological constraints (criteria iii and v); 4) the aesthetic beauty and visual harmony of the resulting landscape (criterion v); 5) the existence of a unique and symbolically qualified product, with an international image widely represented in art (e.g. in literature, painting, photography and cinema) (criterion vi). Consequently, it appears that the justification for the OUV of the winegrowing landscapes included in the WHL is based on their historical, social, aesthetic and symbolic values, predominantly the first two.

In addition, they have all claimed compliance with the conditions of authenticity and integrity (in the latter case, since 2005) and state they have management plans designed to ensure the preservation of their OUV.

### ***3.3. ICOMOS' main critiques and recommendations to the Nomination Files***

While some nominations have been accepted with little or no changes required, others have made substantial changes after taking on board the recommendations of ICOMOS and IUCN. The most recurrent suggestions for improvement made by these advisory bodies to the States Parties have been the following (see Table 2):

- Changes in the OUV justification criteria.

As a result of the recommendations made, four of the nine nominations reduced the number of criteria used to determine their OUV compared to the initial submission: Saint-Emilion, Pico Island, Piedmont and Le Colline del Prosecco. Of these, the case of Le Colline del Prosecco is particularly significant. In 2010, it applied for inscription under criteria (iv) and (v), but finally, in 2019, it based its inscription only on the latter, greatly improving its rationale. Indeed, this is the only property among all those studied that has been inscribed based on one justification criterion (within the context of all properties included in the WHL as cultural landscapes, 16 of the 120 registered in 2022, i.e. 13.3%, have done so on the basis of a single criterion). Saint-Emilion, Pico Island and Piedmont reduced their inscription criteria from three or four to two.

Another relevant change was made in the Alto Douro nomination with regard to the type of criteria. In its evaluation report, ICOMOS stated that this region — rather than a significant interchange of human values (criterion ii) — bore an exceptional testimony to a still living cultural tradition (criterion iii) and recommended reconsidering the criterion.

Following up on this suggestion, Alto Douro finally substantiated the existence of OUV in its landscape on criteria (iii), (iv) and (v).

- Improved justification of OUV and of integrity and authenticity conditions

Other recommendations include providing an improved explanation of the nature of the OUV, especially in serial properties (which must be demonstrated for the property as a whole and for each of its components). Such was the case, for example, in Piedmont, whose previous justification was considered unconvincing as it was too broad and incomplete, or in Burgundy, whose grounds were also regarded as insufficient to support the inclusion of two elements of the serial property (the towns of Dijon and Beaune).

On the other hand, the evaluation reports contain quite a few recommendations regarding compliance with the authenticity and integrity conditions linked to OUV. Proof of this are the suggestions made by ICOMOS during the nomination process for Le Colline del Prosecco, which emphasised the need to 'provide a discussion on the State of Conservation of the landscape, and address the authenticity and integrity of the attributes as they contribute to Outstanding Universal Value' (WHC-19/43.COM/INF.8B1. Add. No 1571rev, p. 12).

- Review and extension of the comparative analysis conducted

A suitable comparative analysis is a key task in preparing a nomination as it serves to ascertain a property's exceptional and/or representative nature in its geo-cultural context. ICOMOS suggested improving this analysis in the last four nominations submitted (Piedmont, Burgundy, Champagne and Le Colline del Prosecco). A study of the respective files shows that the work carried out on this aspect was extremely varied in terms of depth, scope and number of landscapes compared. However, it must be acknowledged that there has been an increasingly refined selection in this respect. The Lavaux file, which focused its comparative analysis on terraced vineyard landscapes on an international scale, is an example of a



successful selection process. The same is true of Le Colline del Prosecco, which, following the ICOMOS advisory procedure, focused the analysis on three attributes they considered to be drivers of OUV (the geomorphology, the ingenuity of farmers, and the landscape mosaic). Firstly, they chose 37 landscapes to establish differences and similarities, and then they selected 5 of these for further study. In contrast, the exclusive use of the WHL and the Tentative List as sources of information on comparable properties has impoverished the analysis in other cases.

- Changes to the boundaries of the property and/or the buffer zone

Modifications to the boundaries of the property and/or the buffer zone were proposed in six of the nine nominations (Tokaj, Lavaux, Piedmont, Burgundy, Champagne and Le Colline del Prosecco). It is advisable to review all boundaries thoroughly to ensure the inclusion of the main attributes and thus the integrity of the property (in Piedmont and Le Colline del Prosecco). More particularly, it is suggested to extend the buffer zone to preserve the visual integrity of the property (e.g. in Tokaj) and to incorporate elements initially excluded but worthy of protection (such as certain underground cellars in Champagne). It is also important to pay special attention to the boundaries of the components of serial properties. Le Colline del Prosecco is unique in that the redrawing of the boundaries to ensure its integrity led it to reduce — rather than extend — the proposed area, which initially coincided with the broader area of the DOCG (Denomination of Controlled and Guaranteed Origin Conegliano Valdobbiadene Prosecco Superiore). It also resulted in it adding a third Commitment Area to the nominated property and the buffer zone. Even so, in the overall ranking of the landscapes studied, it still comes second in terms of extension of the property.

- Enhancing the protection and management measures required to safeguard the OUV

The recommendations of the advisory bodies for vineyard landscape management and monitoring plans have been many and increasingly detailed. These include the following: a) extend the protection through regulatory instruments to the entire nominated property; b) draw up a landscape plan; d) implement measures to protect or to restore the biodiversity of the landscape; e) strengthen cooperation with relevant administrations; f) enhancing the involvement of local communities in the management structures; g) rank the Management Plan actions by order of priority for the property's conservation; h) provide implementation dates for the scheduled and financially consolidated actions; i) ensuring that all new developments are subject to rigorous Heritage Impact Assessment processes that consider their potential impact on the OUV of the property.

Due to its possible exemplary character, the positive assessment by ICOMOS of the management plans of Pico Island (WHC-04/28.COM/INF.14A Add. No 117 Rev), Lavaux (WHC-07/31.COM/INF.8B1. No 1243) and Burgundy (WHC-15/39.COM/INF.8B1. No 1425) is significant.

- More accurate description of the monitoring plan

ICOMOS has highlighted three key aspects: improving the coordination of monitoring tasks, developing a monitoring system capable of identifying changes in landscape mosaics and establishing appropriate management strategies, and specifying the frequency with which indicators should be measured and applied to the property and the buffer zone (e.g. in Le Colline del Prosecco and Burgundy). Furthermore, incorporating indicators related to tourism and cultural activities in the property's monitoring is considered particularly relevant (Piedmont) owing to their importance and effects.

- Submission of more maps

In two of the nine evaluation reports (Burgundy and Le Colline del Prosecco), there was an explicit recommendation to increase the mapping submitted by adding maps of the property's

attributes.

## **4: Discussion and conclusions**

### ***4.1. Inscription categories, names of properties, length of the process, and protected area***

All the nominations studied have followed the Operational Guidelines; however, their assessment must be conducted in the timeframe in which they were prepared for two reasons. Firstly, the WHC requirements have changed in line with changes in the general context of World Heritage policy and the institutionalisation of landscape as a political issue (Briffaud and Brochot 2010). Secondly, the concepts have broadened their meanings and become more nuanced, in accordance with developments in the scientific discourse and other factors such as internal negotiations and frictions within UNESCO and its advisory bodies (Cameron 2005; Baird 2009; Brumann and Gfeller 2022).

The vineyard landscapes included in the WHL that have been studied belong to the organically evolved landscape sub-category and, within this sub-category, primarily to living landscapes, although some also contain relict (or fossil) landscape units. Considering the emphasis UNESCO places on the idea of heritage and, therefore, on the historical dimension of the landscape and the temporal processes that affect it, this landscape classification is consistent with this approach. In any case, this landscape typology gives rise to a critical discussion: if one of the intrinsic features of landscape is its dynamism, to what extent is it possible to differentiate between relict or fossil landscapes and continuing landscapes? And if a landscape is conceived as a social and cultural construct, why are clearly defined landscapes distinguished from other landscapes? Indeed, a universal landscape typology — which meets UNESCO's goals — can be overly simplistic and general; therefore, it should perhaps be

broken down and concretised into various scales that better reflect the broad internal diversity that exists.

The difficulty of defining what constitutes a vineyard landscape of heritage interest has been acknowledged. On the one hand — as Franjus (2007) points out — ‘Combien faut-il de rangs de vignes dans une étendue de terre qui s’offre à la vue pour considérer que l’on est en présence d’un paysage viticole? Et d’ailleurs, est-ce que cette caractéristique quantitative est vraiment importante, ou ne suffit-il pas que la vigne soit tout simplement présente voire même qu’il n’en reste que des traces?’ (as quoted in Briffaud and Brochot 2010, 53). Although no exact quantitative thresholds can be established (e.g. in terms of extension or density of *vitis vinifera*), there must be a predominance of vines in the landscape, in addition to other tangible elements related to their storage and transformation into wine or intangible elements linked to wine culture. This implies that there may be visible evidence but also invisible evidence, such as, for example, an oral tradition. There is a lack of explicit recognition by UNESCO of the ‘continuing landscape’ as a living framework capable of representing a sense of belonging for individuals or groups and linked to a sense of place. In many areas, this predominance of vineyards has increased, especially with the development of transport, the expansion of single-crop farming, and the increasing specialisation in the production of quality wines, mainly since the 20th century. However, in many cases, these trends have led to the loss of the traditional crop mosaic and the simplification of the landscape, calling into question some of the arguments put forward in the nominations to justify their OUV and authenticity. This implies a ‘dissonant heritage’, as defined by Ashworth and Tunbridge (1996).

Furthermore, natural values are often relevant in the vineyard landscapes on the WHL, even if the most outstanding heritage values are based on cultural aspects. The importance of the physical environment led Portugal to propose the inscription of the Landscape of the Pico

Island as a mixed site in 2002, considering that it met the relevant requirements (having at least one cultural and one natural criterion of the ten considered by UNESCO to be of universal value). This consideration also encouraged Switzerland to add two visually powerful natural elements in the Lavaux region to the name of the nomination: Lake Geneva and the Alps. In both cases, the ICOMOS recommendations were taken on board and these aspects were changed: thus, the Landscape of the Pico Island was inscribed in 2004 exclusively as a cultural property, and the initial designation 'Lavaux, vineyard terraces overlooking the lake and the Alps' was replaced by 'Lavaux, Vineyard Terraces'. Another example of the vital role played by elements of the physical environment in certain WHL vineyard landscapes was the choice of geomorphology as the attribute conveying OUV to Le Colline del Prosecco, a choice that was not challenged by ICOMOS. This downplaying of the natural aspects of landscapes is in line with UNESCO's view of 'cultural landscapes' as properties and, more specifically, as sites belonging to 'cultural heritage'. In turn, some consider that the step back taken by IUCN to allow ICOMOS to take the leading role in the nomination process of cultural landscapes has contributed to an under-valuing of the natural dimensions of this heritage category (Cameron 2005, 9).

It has also become increasingly difficult for vineyard landscapes already widely represented in the WHL to be added. Hence, if a state wishes to apply — at least in the European geo-cultural context — it must be aware that it will have to submit nominations that fit well with UNESCO's official discourse, engage in hard work to prepare a good file, and then probably make changes in response to the recommendations proposed by the advisory bodies. The number of changes made to initial nominations has increased in recent submissions; at the same time, the process has been significantly lengthened, largely due to the increasing frequency with which the WHC rejects direct nominations and takes one of two decisions: either to return the nomination and request additional information on the property

from the States Parties (referral of nominations) or to require a deferral for a more substantial review of the file (deferral of nominations). Nominations are hampered by the very complexity and length of the procedure.

Currently, through the official recognition of the nine specific vineyard landscapes inscribed on the WHL, UNESCO is protecting 93,030.92 hectares, an extension that amounts to 571,991.12 hectares if all the buffer zones are added. Each approved vineyard landscape has its own distinct characteristics, and it would be unrealistic to predefine uniform surface area thresholds for nominations to the WHL. Nevertheless, in view of the significant differences regarding surface areas, it can be said that this issue has not yet been appropriately resolved.

#### ***4.2. OUV and the importance of defining the attributes that embody it***

The practical application of the OUV concept to complex cultural properties such as landscapes has proven to be challenging (Cleere 1996; Tricaud 2005). It should be emphasised that the OUV of cultural landscapes does not lie in their cultural or natural properties considered separately, but in their interactions, which can be seen, for example, in the plot layout, in impressive terraces or in unique planting patterns reflecting the agricultural work and the accumulated knowledge of winegrowers as well as the various forms of land use and territorial organisation. These interactions must also be socially recognised as valuable because of the meaning they embody. Although evidence of the divide between natural and cultural heritage remains, the rationale to justify the value of environmental-social relationships has been recurrent in the nine landscapes examined. As regards the issue of universal value (i.e. a property is of such extraordinary cultural importance that it transcends national borders and is considered valuable for present and future humanity), the analysis has found — as Jokilehto (2006, 1) pointed out — that 'it is not easy to draw the line, defining what could be eligible to the World Heritage List, and what would be of national or local

significance'. This identification of properties implies selection and, as such, responds to value judgements that are highly dependent on the spatial, temporal and cultural context. The socio-political and historical contexts of heritage practices of UNESCO were examined by Baird (2009) in her research on World Heritage cultural landscapes. However, from a critical perspective, one can even question whether universal values exist or whether, as Lowenthal argue (1998, 227, quoted in Smith 2006, 110), 'The ability for heritage to be all things to all people is simply absurd'. UNESCO's notion of the heritage of humanity projects an ideal of consensus, which is the main problem in the universal value concept (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2006; Tucker and Carnegie 2014). It is interesting to note that the Nomination Files and the ICOMOS Evaluations for The Alto Douro and Champagne link the 'universal value of the landscape' with the 'universal value of the agri-food product', more specifically, with the international impact of wine ('The Alto Douro, one of the most ancient winemaking regions in the world, one that produces a universally acclaimed wine designated Porto'; 'Champagne is a product of excellence, renowned as the universal symbol of festiveness, celebration and reconciliation').

It has also been found that the initial choice of criteria applied in nominations to justify the OUV of a landscape has not always been entirely appropriate, resulting in the need to reconsider such criteria. Surprisingly, similar arguments have sometimes been used to support different criteria, which suggests that the wording of criteria iii, iv and v — the more frequently applied criteria — is ambiguous. It should be noted that criterion iii expressly refers to exceptionality and criteria iv and v to exemplarity. In this sense, the comments of Cameron (2009, 129) are pertinent when he wonders whether what one is actually seeking is the best of the best or the representative of the best when selecting sites since the required threshold will be lower in the latter case. Identifying that a property is unique in its category or the most relevant because it is the most complete or the best preserved requires, in the

context of UNESCO, a rigorous comparative analysis on a global scale and, therefore, the availability of accessible and high-quality multi-disciplinary scientific documentation. This introduces a discriminatory and unequal situation among countries. It also raises issues of great theoretical significance, including the idea that values are intrinsic to heritage properties and persistent over time (Labadi 2013), and that it is up to the experts to discover them (Smith 2006).

Representativeness in UNESCO is, in turn, linked to The Global Strategy for a Representative and Credible WHL (1994), which aims to achieve a representative, balanced and flexible List. The result is a restrictive List, as the options for inscription are narrowed if properties of the same type and characteristics are already included in the List (Droste, Plachter, and Rössler 1995; Cameron 2009; Martínez, Baraja, and Molinero 2019). The timing of the inscription is, therefore, a key factor. In addition, the search for similar typological and territorial distributions is at odds with exceptionality, which opens up another discussion. This is not to deny the existing imbalances and the smaller presence in the WHL of cultural landscapes from Africa and from South America and the Caribbean (Jokilehto et al. 2004; Fowler 2003; Arroyo 2021). Furthermore, we should not forget that proposals to join the WHL stem from states; hence, the differences based on their capacity to undertake the inscription processes and the commitments resulting from acceptance. In turn, final decisions on an inscription on the WHL are made by an intergovernmental committee (the WHC), which has been criticized by some experts who see a threat of 'increased politicisation within the World Heritage system' (Cameron 2009, 134).

The OUV justifications regarding vineyard landscapes reveal the importance given to historical significance and tradition, pointing to the antiquity and survival of the winegrowing activity as grounds supporting their heritage value. However, it cannot be argued that age or other conditions, such as the rareness and uniqueness of the attributes themselves



automatically guarantee the consideration of OUV (Porcal 2019, 218). Furthermore, is there a time threshold for a property to be considered old or traditional? The analysis of the nomination files of wine-growing landscapes has shown the persistence, in many cases, of a reductionist approach in the way antiquity is justified, which is in line with Smith's criticism (2006, 29) when he stresses that 'The past cannot simply be reduced to archaeological data or historical texts - it is someone's heritage'.

In addition to the historical legacy, the aesthetic component of a landscape has also been used frequently (more specifically in the Alto Douro and Lavaux files), a feature that, in the opinion of Brumann and Gfeller (2022, 149), 'reflects the centrality of aesthetic qualities in French visions of landscape' and its influence on the construction of UNESCO's discourse. However, although the landscapes shaped by the wine culture may be aesthetically pleasing, they were not created as artistic monuments but as production sites and could therefore be described as 'involuntary art' (Clément 1999). The following ICOMOS critique of the Piedmont nomination file is of interest: 'the Outstanding Universal Value has not yet been fully demonstrated (...). It is incomplete because it focuses solely on the vineyards' aesthetic aspects and omits important built components (cellars and wine houses in the urban environment, etc.) (WHC-14/38.COM/INF.8B1. No 1390rev, pp. 260-261). The evaluation of a landscape from an exclusively aesthetic perspective can transmit an excessively idealised image of the rural reality in addition to being based on value judgements that are highly conditioned by the cultural context.

On the other hand, we have observed the relevance in the WHL of vineyard landscapes built under adverse ecological conditions, which have historically forced winegrowers to be resourceful in developing cultivation techniques and systems adapted to the environment. As a result, the value of the terraces built on steep slopes and thin soils (at Alto Douro, Lavaux, Piedmont and Le Colline del Prosecco) and the traditional farming

method on the volcanic island of Pico, where the vines must be protected from the strong winds, are particularly acknowledged. This highlights one of the main contradictions of heritage wine-growing landscapes: the difficulty of maintaining living, functional landscapes and, at the same time, preserving traditional and unique planting, vine management and winemaking systems. The coexistence of relict and more dynamic vineyard landscapes on Pico Island and in Alto Douro is proof of this.

The analysis reveals that it is essential to formulate UNESCO's inscription criteria — which are extremely broad and ambiguous — as attributes. For this reason, we can commend the work that has been carried out on this aspect in the Le Colline del Prosecco, Lavaux and Burgundy files. Furthermore, in the context of UNESCO, these tangible and intangible attributes on which the OUV is based must not only be rigorously inventoried and documented but also geolocated and mapped at an appropriate scale, especially bearing in mind that the ultimate goal is their conservation and protection, which constitutes a challenge in terms of mapping due to the difficulty of this task. The excellent work done in this respect in the final Burgundy file is particularly noteworthy. However, it should also be noted that, for some, this ‘spatial heritagization’ reflects a traditional, Western view of heritagization processes.

#### ***4.3. Authenticity and integrity***

The concepts of authenticity and integrity in the field of World Heritage as applied to cultural landscapes have been discussed in numerous works (Rössler 2006; Stovel 2007; Pendlebury, Short, and While 2009; Gullino and Larcher 2013; Gfeller 2017), which — as far as the former concept is concerned — have proliferated following its recognition in The Nara Document on Authenticity (ICOMOS 1994). From a philosophical perspective, authenticity is understood to be closely related to the concept of truth (Jokilehto 2006; Inaba 2009) and to be a quality that resides in the object itself, so it is up to the subject to recognise it (Jokilehto

2006, 161; Mendes, Lira, and Piccolo 2009, 168). According to the Operational Guidelines 'properties may be understood to meet the conditions of authenticity if their cultural values (as recognised in the nomination criteria proposed) are truthfully and credibly expressed through a variety of attributes, including: materials and substance; use and function; traditions, techniques and management systems [...]' (Operational Guidelines 2021, paragraph 82).

Protecting the authenticity of outstanding cultural values found in evolving and living landscapes is challenging. In the case of vineyard landscapes, this would imply that 'landscapes may be subject to change of use and introduction of new techniques. This would be acceptable so long as these changes do not jeopardise any of the World Heritage values for which the sites have been inscribed' (UNESCO 2001, recommendation 6). Nevertheless, what happens if some of those features that qualify them as a valuable legacy, e.g. terrace systems, cease to be functional, economically profitable or prove to be labour intensive and are abandoned? We have found that even the reconstruction of heritage has been accepted in exceptional circumstances (e.g. in the troubled Tokaj region, which in 1990 started to rebuild its winegrowing activity), as has happened in the case of certain historical cities. However, as Cameron (2009, 131) acknowledges, the admission of authenticity regarding a reconstructed site is a contradiction and represents a departure from the WHC's 1980 exceptional inscription of the historical centre of Warsaw in the WHL.

On the other hand, it is clear that the reliability and credibility of the sources that make it possible to understand the 'significance' of a landscape and justify the authenticity of its OUV play a key role. Indeed, heritage documentation possesses such relevance and acquires - in itself - heritage value, which justifies its preservation. 'The preservation of information is framed within the broader context of the management of scientific knowledge' (Porcal-Gonzalo 2016, 291). Despite the changes introduced by The Nara Document on Authenticity, identifying the authenticity of inhabited rural landscapes altered by daily use remains

problematic and their conservation, from the WHL perspective, has contradictions, mainly due to the difficulty posed by their scale.

However, to be eligible for the WHL, a vineyard landscape — in addition to being authentic and credible — must be coherent and well-preserved. Since 2005, the Operational Guidelines establish that integrity is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the natural and/or cultural heritage and its attributes [...] Therefore, the examination requires assessing the extent to which the property: a) includes all elements necessary to express its Outstanding Universal Value; b) is of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features and processes which convey the property's significance; c) suffers from adverse effects of development and/or neglect (Operational Guidelines 2005, paragraph 88).

It is clear that the integrity of a vineyard landscape can be heavily impacted by several elements, especially by active quarries and industrial infrastructure (Burgundy), high-rise buildings and housing developments (Burgundy and Pico Island) and unsightly cables and dumps of construction debris (Tojak), usually located in the buffer zone. In addition, there are threats such as the changes brought about by an intensive and mechanised wine production model, erosion phenomena, which particularly affect steeply sloping terraced vineyards, and climate change. Some of the most extraordinary vineyard landscapes are protected from socio-economic pressures because they are difficult to access (e.g. Pico Island), suggesting that, to some extent, orographic and geographic location constraints help to preserve the authenticity and integrity of an area.

However, the most pressing universal threat to cultural landscapes and vineyard landscapes today is undoubtedly climate change, which is why in recent years, this issue has been the focus of special attention from the scientific community as well as from ICOMOS and the WHC (UNESCO 2007; Melnick 2016; ICOMOS 2019; Aktürk and Dastgerdi 2021). One of the main effects is that higher temperatures and periods of reduced rainfall will alter

the current territorial distribution of vineyards, which would jeopardise the very survival of the heritage landscapes included in the WHL (particularly those in the Mediterranean area). However, by broadening the scope of observation, the direct and indirect effects of climate change can be numerous: for example, difficulties in maintaining old vines and growing certain grape varieties in specific areas, the relocation of vineyards to higher altitudes as the climatic optimum for cultivation shifts, the increased risk of soil erosion due to more intense rainfall, changes in agricultural practices, the abandonment of the activity, and the loss of heritage values.

#### ***4.4. Property boundaries and the Management Plan***

As Smith (2006, 31) observe, the idea of the materiality of heritage is linked to the idea of its boundedness. In the context of WHL, defining appropriate physical boundaries for the property and buffer zone is essential to ensure its integrity. A coherent area must be determined that is not dictated by current national or regional borders but is based on in-depth multi-disciplinary scientific analysis and consensus among stakeholders, which is no easy task. An example of historical coherence (which can still be improved) is found in Tokaj, whose designated World Heritage area extends beyond the current Hungarian border, incorporating two areas belonging to Slovakia. We have observed that, sometimes, during the WHL nomination process, the delimitation of the property precedes the identification and justification of the OUV when it should be the other way around or, at least, take place at the same time.

Traditionally, the primary goal in the field of heritage has been protection; however, with the incorporation of complex heritage categories such as continuously evolving landscapes, the sustainable management of the territory takes on a key role. As UNESCO has acknowledged, 'There is a need to avoid nostalgia in the conservation of cultural landscapes. An honest and pragmatic approach to the conservation of cultural landscapes is required'

WHC-96/CONF.201/NF.9, p. 3). This calls for targeted transformations and the detailed and systematic monitoring of the state of conservation of the attributes that contribute to the OUV. However, UNESCO does not set out how this should be done. A particularly noteworthy proposal was put forward by Lavaux, which established static and dynamic indicators to evaluate the effectiveness of the actions undertaken over time. An interesting procedure linked to managing continuing rural landscapes is dynamic conservation, applied by FAO to Globally-Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) (Koohafkan and Altieri 2011).

In accordance with the Committee Recommendation (Decision 43 COM 11A), an express acknowledgement of the risk of climate change and a proposal for climate change adaptation actions have been added to the Le Colline del Prosecco Management Plan.

In this respect, there are many questions worth discussing and researching. There have been many recommendations made by ICOMOS that have been taken on board by UNESCO regarding heritage protection and conservation and land management in countries — such as European countries — with generally well-established and mature planning systems. But how can all these requirements be implemented in countries in the Global South that have fewer means to do so? And even if possible, to what extent is it desirable to transpose European or Western models to other countries? How to ensure the future conservation of an internationally recognised property whose management depends on local governance processes? (Pendlebury et al. 2009, 350). How can this be achieved if such processes also require present and future accountability? And how is it possible to preserve the integrity of vineyard landscapes that are highly influenced by external factors, such as agricultural policies, the Common Organisation of the Market in Wine, fluctuations in grape and wine prices, or pressures from other sectors such as infrastructure and tourism?

## 5. Conclusions

In light of the above analysis and discussion, several key issues need to be highlighted regarding the inscription process of vineyard landscapes in the WHL.

Defining the nature of the landscape precisely by identifying its distinct features and exceptional heritage specificities in relation to other landscapes in the same category has proved crucial. Consequently, comparative analyses and the prior definition of a scientifically sound classification are key tasks that have not always been well resolved in the Nomination Files.

We have found that a territory that contains a large number of heritage elements — even of outstanding universal interest (wineries, monasteries, traditions, etc.) — does not necessarily have to be a cultural heritage landscape, but that to qualify as such, the landscape itself, as an integrated whole, must be a socially perceived and valued heritage asset. We have also highlighted the particular complexity of serial properties that risk fragmenting this unity.

It is evident that the important spatial dimension of the cultural landscape concept requires that greater attention be paid to the delimitation of the area covered by the properties, to their boundaries (which will vary according to the criteria adopted for their establishment), to the identification of the attributes that are the bases of their OUV and to their relationship with other components of the territory.

In turn, the analysis of procedures and discourses has highlighted several contradictions and key issues for further discussion.

It has been found that dominant discourses are adopted to ensure UNESCO's recognition and that in the course of the nomination process arguments are corrected and redressed, leading to what Smith (2006, 101) calls 'the regulation of dissonance through the nomination process'. Thus, the landscape may be the same, but the discourse changes in response to the growing number of recommendations made by experts in their Evaluation Reports. These reports convey specific ideas reflecting the application of the Convention's

concepts and the Operational Guidelines's concepts, but also the academic background and experience of these experts.

It has become evident that the procedure for listing a cultural landscape in the WHL takes place within a rigid and complex framework, probably over-dependent on the 1972 Convention, where some of the key concepts can be more easily applied to monumental properties but are overly general, vague and even questionable in the case of continuing landscapes.

In the light of the analysis conducted, it appears that the primary and ultimate purpose of a World Heritage nomination is the inclusion of the property on the List, which becomes — as Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (2004, 57) point out — a context for everything it contains (as has been shown in the comparative studies included in the Nomination Files of some wine-growing landscapes). However, the real challenge is adopting safeguards to ensure the resilience of the territory and the conservation of the landscape's heritage value. In recent years, UNESCO's insistence on this latter aspect is probably due to the severe problems that have affected some World Heritage cultural landscapes, which have even led them to be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The considerable territorial imbalance of the cultural landscapes included in the WHL highlighted in some studies (Brumann and Gfeller 2022) has not only been confirmed, but has increased in the case of wine-growing landscapes, as they are all located in Europe. Notably absent from the List are vineyards from Chile, California and Australia, but also Spain, which has the world's largest surface area of vineyards (964 kha in 2021, according to the International Organisation of Vine and Wine, OIV) and is home to outstanding wine-growing landscapes of great cultural interest.

We must be mindful of the major difficulties involved in heritage conservation in living landscapes linked to agri-food systems, such as vineyard landscapes. These include the



difficulty arising from the lack of powers to address all the factors that have an interlinked and dynamic impact on the maintenance and evolution of wine-growing activities (e.g. effects of climate change, wine prices and demand, agricultural policies, land purchases and heavy investment by large wineries and the shift from the agricultural sector to the tourism sector). The understanding of heritage cannot be separated from the sense of place, nor can the preservation of heritage values be separated from territorial management. In turn, UNESCO documents and some ICOMOS Evaluation Reports refer to the requirement to ‘involve’ the local population in the management process. However, we must not forget that this population should be the true protagonist of the heritage process and that winegrowers and winemakers are usually the owners of the land and the main experts and managers of the agricultural territory.

Finally, given their importance, the Nomination Files and the Evaluation Reports lack a greater focus on the conservation and management challenges facing wine-growing heritage landscapes in the context of accelerated climate change.

### **Indication of figures and tables**

Table 1. List of the UNESCO documents analyzed

Table 2. Inscription of Vineyard Territories as Cultural Landscapes on the World Heritage List (1992-2022) and ICOMOS Recommendations in the Evaluation Reports

### **References**

- Adell, N., R. Bendix, C. Bortolotto, and M. Tauschek. 2015. *Between Imagined Communities of Practice: Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage*. Göttingen: Göttingen University Press.
- Aktürk, G., and A.S. Dastgerdi. 2021. “Cultural landscapes under the threat of climate change: a systematic study of barriers to resilience.” *Sustainability* 13 (17): 9974. doi:10.3390/su13179974.

- Arroyo Belmonte, R. 2021. "Alienación territorial a través del patrimonio mundial: análisis de la Lista del Patrimonio Mundial de América Latina y el Caribe desde la perspectiva de la geopolítica crítica." *Relaciones Internacionales* 48: 123-141. doi:10.15366/relacionesinternacionales2021.48.007
- Ashworth, G. J. 2017. *Senses of place: Senses of time*. London: Routledge
- Ashworth, G., and J. Tunbridge. 1996. *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Baird, M. F. 2009. *The politics of place: Heritage, identity, and the epistemologies of cultural landscapes*. Oregon: University of Oregon.
- Briffaud, S., and A. Brochot, eds. 2010. *Paysages d'exception, paysages au quotidien. Une analyse comparative de sites viticoles européens du Patrimoine mondial (Rapport de recherche)*. Paris: Ministère de l'Écologie, de l'Énergie, du Développement durable et de la Mer.
- Brumann, C. 2015. "Community as Myth and Reality in the UNESCO World Heritage Convention." In *Between Imagined Communities of Practice: Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage*, edited by Nicolas Adell, Regina F. Bendix, Chiara Bortolotto, and Markus Tauschek, 273-289. Göttingen: Göttingen University Press. <https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/id/b23f81b6-3fde-49e5-a672-bdaa88a7b011/610380.pdf>
- Brumann, C., and A. É. Gfeller. 2022. "Cultural landscapes and the UNESCO World Heritage List: perpetuating European dominance." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 28 (2): 147-162. doi:10.1080/13527258.2021.1941197.
- Cameron, C. 2005. Evaluation of IUCN's work in World Heritage Nominations. *Global Programme of IUCN*. <https://www.iucn.org/sites/default/files/2022-05/global-evaluation-of-iucns-work-in-heritage-nominations.pdf>
- Cameron, C. 2009. "The Evolution of the Concept of Outstanding Universal Value." In *Conserving the Authentic. Essays in Honour of Jukka Jokilehto*, edited by Nicholas Stanley-Price, and Joseph King, 127-136. Rome: ICCROM.
- Claval, P. 2002. "El enfoque cultural y las concepciones geográficas del espacio." *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles* 34: 21-39.
- Cleere, H. 1996. "The Concept of 'Outstanding Universal Value' in the World Heritage Convention." *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 1 (4): 227-233. doi:10.1179/135050396793139042.

- Cleere, H. 2001. "The uneasy bedfellows: universality and cultural heritage." In *Destruction and conservation of cultural property*, edited by Robert Layton, Peter G. Stone, and Julian Thomas, 22-29. London: Routledge.
- Cleere, H. 2004. "World Heritage Vineyard Landscapes." *World Heritage Review* 35: 10-19.
- Clément, G. 1999. *Traité succinct de l'art involontaire*. Paris: Tonka.
- Cosgrove, D. E. 1998. *Social formation and symbolic landscape*. London: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Di Giovine, M.A. 2009. *The Heritage-scape: UNESCO, World Heritage, and Tourism*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Di Giovine, M. A. 2017. "The heritage-scape: origins, theoretical interventions, and critical reception of a model for understanding UNESCO's World Heritage Program." *Via. Tourism Review*, no. 13:13. doi:10.4000/viatourism.2017.
- Droste, Bernd von, Harald Plachter, and Mechtild Rössler, eds. 1995. *Cultural Landscapes of Universal Value. Components of a Global Strategy*. Jena (Germany): Fischer Verlag in cooperation with UNESCO.
- Fowler, P. J. 2003. *World Heritage Cultural Landscapes 1992–2002*. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
- Gentry, K., and L. Smith. 2019. "Critical heritage studies and the legacies of the late-twentieth century heritage canon." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 25 (11): 1148-1168. doi:10.1080/13527258.2019.1570964.
- Gfeller, A.E. 2017. "The Authenticity of Heritage: Global Norm-Making at the Crossroads of Cultures." *American Historical Review* 122 (3): 758-791. doi:10.1093/ahr/122.3.758.
- Graham, B., G. J. Ashworth, and J. E. Tunbridge. 2016. *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. London: Routledge.
- Gullino, P., and F. Larcher. 2013. "Integrity in UNESCO World Heritage Sites: A Comparative Study for Rural Landscapes." *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 14 (5): 389-395. doi:10.1016/j.culher.2012.10.005.
- Harrison, R. 2013. *Heritage: critical approaches*. London: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203108857.
- Harvey, D.C. 2001. "Heritage Pasts and Heritage Presents: Temporality, Meaning, and the Scope of Heritage Studies." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 7 (4): 319- 338. doi:10.1080/13581650120105534.

- Harvey, D.C., and Waterton, E. 2015. "Editorial: Landscapes of heritage and heritage landscapes." *Landscape Research* 40 (8): 905-910. doi:10.1080/01426397.2015.1086563.
- Hobsbawm, E. 1983. "Introduction: Inventing traditions." In *The invention of tradition*, edited by Eric Hobsbawm, and Terence Ranger, 1–14. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites). 1994. *Nara Declaration on Authenticity and Cultural Diversity*. Accessed 8 September 2022. <https://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/386-the-nara-documenton-authenticity-1994>
- ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites). 2005. *Étude thématique sur les paysages culturels viticoles dans le cadre de la Convention du Patrimoine Mondial de l'UNESCO*. Accessed 8 September 2022. <http://www.icomos.org/fr/a-propos-du-centre/publicationsdoc-2/116-english-categories/resources/publications/224-les-paysages-culturels-viticoles>
- ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites). 2017. "ICOMOS-IFLA Principles Concerning Rural Landscapes as Heritage." GA 2017 6-3-1-Doctrinal Texts. Accessed 8 September 2022. [https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Charters/GA2017\\_6-3-1\\_RuralLandscapesPrinciples\\_EN\\_adopted-15122017.pdf](https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Charters/GA2017_6-3-1_RuralLandscapesPrinciples_EN_adopted-15122017.pdf)
- ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites). 2019. *The Future of Our Pasts: Engaging Cultural Heritage in Climate Action*. Paris: ICOMOS. <https://openarchive.icomos.org/id/eprint/2459>
- Inaba, N. 2009. "Authenticity and Heritage Concepts: Tangible and Intangible - Discussions in Japan." In *Conserving the Authentic. Essays in Honour of Jukka Jokilehto*, edited by Nicholas Stanley-Price, and Joseph King, 153-162. Rome: ICCROM.
- Jokilehto, J. 2006. "World Heritage: Defining the Outstanding Universal Value." *City & Time* 2 (2): 1-10.
- Jokilehto, J., H. Cleere, S. Denyer, and M. Petzet. 2004. *The World Heritage List. Filling the Gaps –An Action Plan for the Future*. Paris: ICOMOS.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. 2004. "Intangible Heritage as Metacultural Production." *Museum International* 56 (1-2): 52-64. doi: 10.1111/j.1350-0775.2004.00458.x.

- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. 2006. "World heritage and cultural economics." In *Museum Frictions: Public cultures/global transformations*, edited by Gustavo Buntix, Ciraj Rassool, and Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 161-202. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- Koohafkan, P., and M. Altieri. 2011. *A methodological framework for the dynamic conservation of agricultural heritage systems*. Geneva (Switzerland): Land and Water Division, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations.
- Labadi, S. 2007. "Representations of the Nation and Cultural Diversity in Discourses on World." *Heritage Journal of Social Archaeology* 7 (2):147-170. doi:10.1177/1469605307077466.
- Labadi, S. 2013. *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value. Value-based Analyses of the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Landorf, C. 2009. "A Framework for Sustainable Heritage Management: A Study of UK Industrial Heritage Sites." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 15 (6): 494–510. doi:10.1080/13527250903210795.
- Legouy, François, and Sylvaine Boulanger, eds. 2015. *Atlas de la vigne et du vin. Un nouveau défi de la mondialisation*. Paris: Éditions Armand Colin.
- Lowenthal, D. 1985. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lowenthal, D. 1998. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*, second ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Luginbühl, Yves. 2005. "Introduction: Paysages viticoles." In *Étude thématique sur les paysages culturels viticoles dans le cadre de la Convention du Patrimoine Mondial de l'UNESCO*, edited by ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites), 15-21. Paris: ICOMOS.
- Martínez Arnáiz, M., E. Baraja, and F. Molinero. 2019. "UNESCO Criteria for the Declaration of Viticultural Regions as Cultural Landscape. Its Application to the Spanish Case." [Criterios de la UNESCO para la declaración de regiones vitícolas como paisaje cultural: su aplicación al caso español.] *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles* 80: 1–33. doi:10.21138/bage.2614.
- Melnick, R. Z. 2016. "Deciphering cultural landscape heritage in the time of climate change." *Landscape Journal*, 35 (2): 287-302. doi:10.3368/lj.35.2.287.

- Mendes, S., F. Lira, and R. Piccolo. 2009. "Judging the Authenticity of the City." In *Conserving the Authentic. Essays in Honour of Jukka Jokilehto*, edited by Nicholas Stanley-Price, and Joseph King, 163-168. Rome: ICCROM.
- Paradiso, C. 2022. "A vineyard landscape, a UNESCO inscription and a National Park: A historical-anthropological analysis of heritagization and tourism development in the Cinque Terre (Italy)." In *Landscape as Heritage: International Critical Perspectives*, edited by Giacomo Pettenati, 56-66. London: Routledge.
- Pendlebury, J., M. Short, and A. While. 2009. "Urban World Heritage Sites and the Problem of Authenticity." *Cities* 26: 349–358. doi:10.1016/j.cities.2009.09.003.
- Penning-Rowsell, E.C. 1986. "Themes, speculations and an agenda for landscape research." In *Landscape meanings and values*, edited by Edmund C. Penning-Rowsell, and David Lowenthal, 114-128. London: Routledge.
- Pettenati, G. 2022. *Landscape as Heritage: International Critical Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Pitte, J.R. 2009. *Le désir du vin à la conquête du monde*. Paris: Fayard.
- Porcal-Gonzalo, María C. 2016. "A Strategy for the Management, Preservation, and Reutilization of Geographical Information Based on the Lifecycle of Geospatial Data: An Assessment and a Proposal Based on Experiences from Spain and Europe." *Journal of Map & Geography Libraries* 11 (3): 289-329. doi:10.1080/15420353.2015.1064054.
- Porcal-Gonzalo, María C. 2019. "The Search for Specificities in the Character of Vineyard Landscapes and the Identification of their Heritagization Processes. The Rioja Alavesa as a Laboratory." [Búsqueda de especificidades en el carácter de los paisajes del viñedo e identificación de sus procesos de patrimonialización. La Rioja Alavesa como laboratorio.] *Cuadernos Geográficos* 58 (2): 215-239. doi:10.30827/cuadgeo.v58i2.7390.
- Rössler, M. 2006. "World Heritage Cultural Landscapes: a UNESCO Flagship Programme 1992-1996." *Landscape Research* 31 (4): 333-353. doi:10.1080/01426390601004210.
- Silverman, H. 2010. *Contested Cultural Heritage. Religion, Nationalism, Erasure, and Exclusion in a Global World*. New York: Springer.
- Smith, J. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Stovel H. 2007. "Effective Use of Authenticity and Integrity as World Heritage Qualiifying Conditions." *City & Time* 2 (3): 21-36.

- Tricaud, P-M. 2005. "L'application aux paysages de vignobles des criteres d'eligibilite au Patrimoine Mondial". In *Étude thématique sur les paysages culturels viticoles dans le cadre de la Convention du Patrimoine Mondial de l'UNESCO*, edited by ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites), 145-155. Paris: ICOMOS.
- Tucker, H., and E. Carnegie. 2014. "World heritage and the contradictions of universal value." *Annals of Tourism Research* 47: 63 -76. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2014.04.003
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization). 1972. *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. <https://whc.unesco.org/archive/convention-en.pdf>
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization). 1994. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris: World Heritage Centre. Accessed 8 September 2022. <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide94.pdf>
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization). 2001. *World Heritage Thematic Expert Meeting on Vineyard Cultural Landscapes*, Tokai (Hungary), July 11-14. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape/>
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization). 2007. *Climate Change and World Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre (World Heritage Reports 22) <https://whc.unesco.org/en/series/22/>
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization). 2021. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. WHC.21/01 31 July 2021. <https://whc.unesco.org/document/190976>.
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization). 2022. *World Heritage List*. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>
- Unwin, T. 2001. *El vino y la viña. Geografía histórica de la viticultura y el comercio del vino* [Wine and the Vine. A Historical Geography of Viticulture and the Wine Trade.] Barcelona: Tusquets Editores.
- Waitt, G. 2000. "Consuming heritage: Perceived historical authenticity." *Annals of Tourism Research* 27 (4): 835-862. doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00115-2.
- Waterton, E., and L. Smith. 2010. "The recognition and misrecognition of community heritage." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (1-2): 4-15. doi:10.1080/13527250903441671.

Wiktor-Mach, D. 2019. "Cultural heritage and development: UNESCO's new paradigm in a changing geopolitical context." *Third world quarterly* 40 (9): 1593-1612. doi: 10.1080/01436597.2019.1604131.



Table 1. List of the UNESCO documents analyzed

<b>Short Name</b>	<b>Nomination Files /Management Plans</b>	<b>URL</b>	<b>Advisory Bodies Evaluations (ICOMOS)</b>	<b>URL</b>	<b>Decisions of the WHC</b>	<b>URL</b>
Saint-Emilion	Nomination file 932	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/932.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/932.pdf</a>	No. 932 (1999)	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/932/documents/">https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/932/documents/</a>	CONF 209 VIII.C.1	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/archive/1999/whc-99-conf209-22e.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/archive/1999/whc-99-conf209-22e.pdf</a>
Alto Douro	Nomination file 1046	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1046.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1046.pdf</a>	No 1046 (2001)	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1046/documents/">https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1046/documents/</a>	CONF 208 X.A	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2001/whc-01-conf208-24e.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2001/whc-01-conf208-24e.pdf</a>
Tokaj	Nomination file 1063	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1063.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1063.pdf</a>	No 1063 (2002)	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1063/documents/">https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1063/documents/</a>	CONF 202 23.13	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2002/whc-02-conf202-25e.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2002/whc-02-conf202-25e.pdf</a>
Pico Island	Nomination file 1117rev	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1117rev.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1117rev.pdf</a>	WHC-04/28.COM/INF.14A Add. No 117 Rev.	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/whc04-28com-inf14aadde.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/whc04-28com-inf14aadde.pdf</a>	28 COM 14B.52	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/whc04-28com-26e.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2004/whc04-28com-26e.pdf</a>
Lavaux	Nomination file 1243	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1243.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1243.pdf</a>	WHC-07/31.COM/INF.8B1. No 1243	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1243/documents/">https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1243/documents/</a>	31 COM 8B.46	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2007/whc07-31com-24e.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2007/whc07-31com-24e.pdf</a>
Piedmont	Nomination file 1390rev	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1390rev.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1390rev.pdf</a>	WHC-14/38.COM/INF.8B1. No 1390 rev	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2014/whc14-38com-inf8B1-en.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2014/whc14-38com-inf8B1-en.pdf</a>	38 COM 8B.41	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2014/whc14-38com-16en.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2014/whc14-38com-16en.pdf</a>
Burgundy	Nomination file 1425	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1425.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1425.pdf</a>	WHC-15/39.COM/INF.8B1. No 1425	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2015/whc15-39com-inf8B1-en.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2015/whc15-39com-inf8B1-en.pdf</a>	39 COM 8B.23	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2015/whc15-39com-19-en.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2015/whc15-39com-19-en.pdf</a>
Champagne	Nomination file 1465	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1465-1.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1465-1.pdf</a>	WHC-15/39.COM/INF.8B1. No 1465	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2015/whc15-39com-inf8B1-en.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2015/whc15-39com-inf8B1-en.pdf</a>	39 COM 8B.24	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2015/whc15-39com-19-en.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2015/whc15-39com-19-en.pdf</a>
Le Colline del Prosecco	Nomination file 1571rev	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1571/documents/">https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1571/documents/</a>	WHC-19/43.COM/INF.8B1. Add. No 1571rev	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2019/whc19-43com-inf8B1.Add-en.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2019/whc19-43com-inf8B1.Add-en.pdf</a>	43 COM 8B.37	<a href="https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2019/whc19-43com-18-en.pdf">https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2019/whc19-43com-18-en.pdf</a>

Table 2. Inscription of Vineyard Territories as Cultural Landscapes on the World Heritage List (1992-2022) and ICOMOS Recommendations in the Evaluation Reports

<b>Short Name</b>	<b>State Party</b>	<b>WHC Year</b>	<b>Property (ha)</b>	<b>Buffer Zone (ha)</b>	<b>Inscription criteria</b>	<b>ICOMOS Recommendations</b>
Saint-Emilion	France	1999	7,847	5,101	(iii), (iv)	C, G
Alto Douro	Portugal	2001	24,600	225,400	(iii), (iv), (v)	C, G
Tokaj	Hungary	2002	13,255	74,879	(iii), (v)	D, F
Pico Island	Portugal	2004	987	1,924	(iii), (v)	A, C
Lavaux	Switzerland	2007	898	1,408	(iii), (iv), (v)	B, F
Piedmont	Italy	2014	10,789	76,249	(iii), (v)	C,D, E, F, G, H
Burgundy	France	2015	13,219	50,011	(iii), (v)	A, D, E, F, H,I
Champagne	France	2015	1,101	4,251	(iii), (iv), (vi)	E, F, G, H
Le Colline del Prosecco	Italy	2019	20,334	43,988	(v)	C, D,E, F, G, H, I

Note: Cultural landscapes as listed on <https://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape/>

ICOMOS Recommendations A= Changes related to the category of the property; B= Property name changes; C= Changes in the OUV justification criteria; D= Improve justification of OUV and authenticity conditions; E= Improve and expand the comparative analysis carried out; F= Modify the boundaries of the property and/or the buffer zone; G= Review and improve the management plan and the monitoring system; H= Review and improve heritage protection and conservation measures; I= Submission of more maps.