

**Workshop for World Heritage National Focal Points from Central,
Eastern and South-Eastern Europe
within the framework of the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting
Exercise on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention
Tbilisi, Georgia, 14 – 16 November 2012**

WORKSHOP REPORT
Katri Lisitzin

SUMMARY OF KEY OUTCOMES

The workshop confirmed that the trends and challenges from the 1st Cycle of Periodic Reporting prevail; there is a need for a new thinking and better understanding of World Heritage concepts on all levels; for a more effective legal and institutional integration in management and for enhancing community involvement in all activities.

There is an ongoing revision of legal and institutional frameworks in the region. An update is necessary in order to face today's conservation challenges. The participants proposed a meeting focusing on World Heritage and legal issues where the role of National Focal Points should be underlined.

Capacity building needs regarding communication and community involvement was shared and the workshop proposed that World Heritage activities should focus more on the topic.

The World Heritage Centre's proposal for a steering committee on regional capacity building strategy development was welcomed. The workshop made a proposal for steering committee members and agreed on a tentative timeframe.

INTRODUCTION

The Workshop for World Heritage National Focal Points from Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe within the framework of the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention took place in Tbilisi, Georgia. Nearly 40 participants from 21 countries attended together with representatives from UNESCO World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies; IUCN; ICOMOS and ICCROM.

Mr. Guram Odisharia, Minister for Culture and Monuments Protection of Georgia, Mr Nikoloz Vacheishvili, Director General of the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation in Georgia and Ms Ketevan Katelaki, Secretary General, Georgian National Commission for UNESCO welcomed the participants to Georgia and to the workshop. They pointed out that the workshop presents an opportunity to discuss and clarify opportunities and challenges for the sustainable protection and management of World Heritage.

Ms Petya Totcharova, Chief of the Europe & North America Unit, World Heritage Centre, and Ms Anna P. Sidorenko World Heritage Centre Focal Point for Central, Eastern and South-

Eastern Europe thanked authorities for hosting the workshop and emphasized the importance to discuss the future of the World Heritage Convention and its strategic objectives; 'the 5C's' with a specific focus on community involvement.

THE WORKSHOP

The workshop was structured in two parts. The first day, the presentations comprised the introduction to the 2nd Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise, and presentations on specific conservation and management issues by property category. The second day of the workshop was dedicated to a discussion on the use of the Periodic Reporting exercise in support of the implementation of the '5C's' Strategic Objectives adopted by the World Heritage Committee.

A site visit to World Heritage properties Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Kutaisi) was organised the third day.

All presentations can be found at the Periodic Reporting website http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/958/

INTRODUCTION TO THE 2ND CYCLE OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE

The discussions confirmed that the trends and challenges from the 1st cycle of Periodic Reporting prevail; the need for a better understanding of the heritage concepts; need for more integration between cultural and natural heritage legislation and management; need for more partnership activities, professional training and training coordination.

Progress report of the Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value

World Heritage Centre informed that 26 Statements of Outstanding Universal Value have not yet been submitted from the region. *The relevance of Statement of Outstanding Universal Value* for the whole World Heritage management process was highlighted. The process of revising Statements of Outstanding Universal Value is time consuming and it is advisable to give them a high priority in State Party actions. The participants were reminded of the revised Operational Guidelines (2012) where this issue is given special attention.

Periodic Reporting Section I regards not only World Heritage, but also all natural and cultural heritage sites. This fact prompted a discussion about World Heritage status related to other protected areas. There were arguments that the State Party's task should be limited to only inscribed sites due to the workload with WH Periodic Reporting. However, the domain of the *WH Convention is all natural and cultural heritage*; not only inscribed properties.

The Periodic Reporting Handbook for site managers was introduced and distributed to participants in English and Russian versions
--

Submitting the Periodic Reporting Questionnaire

Some of the questions about filling in the Questionnaires were clarified:

Translation of the questionnaire is necessary but time consuming and must be done as soon as possible. The participants were concerned with the time limits. The word version of the Questionnaire is available, but the password for the online version will not be given until September 2013. The participants enquired if there is new information to be translated (e.g. pop-ups) in the online version but the WHC informed that all information needed for filling the Questionnaire is the same as in the word version. The handbook should give sufficient guidance in this respect. The deadline for site managers' submission can be set at national level.

The online submission is compulsory, but if needed a printed version can be sent in as well. The submission and *signing of serial, transboundary and transnational* properties was clarified. For serial properties, only questionnaire (Section II) per property shall be submitted, which should be answered in consultation with all relevant site managers and stakeholders. For transboundary and transnational properties, only one questionnaire shall be submitted. It should be prepared jointly. The States Parties decide on one Focal Point per property to validate the Section II questionnaire. Minor boundary modifications from both States Parties should be submitted, as every change affects the property.

OVERVIEW OF KEY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ISSUES

The Advisory Bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM) stressed the important *role of site managers*. It is urgent to raise awareness and update about the World Heritage framework and clarify roles and responsibilities in site management. The site managers' task includes also organizing meetings and setting up networking activities. The effectiveness of the management process is highly depending on the active participation of both local authorities and the citizens.

The experiences from Periodic Reporting 1st Cycle proved that the process has a function as a proactive tool for monitoring and for the integration of natural and cultural heritage. Moreover, it was found that it facilitates international cooperation. The Advisory Bodies pointed out that the condition for management success is to mobilize and work with all stakeholders, beyond heritage authorities. Give specific attention to sustaining the dynamics of the process!

The participants brought up the need for a new thinking and international discourse. In many cases *the cultural heritage definitions need to be updated to face today's management challenges*. OUV is not visible in management plans – and as Croatia pointed out, 'a good vision of OUV would help to decide how to care about it'. There is a need for more actions and support in this direction. WHC reminded about the opportunity to come up with proposals for enhancing the capacity building activities on regional level. There are successful experiences of ongoing regional capacity building activities, for example the current World Heritage Nomination training workshops in the Africa region.

The participants highlighted the necessity of a broad consultation basis, including the civil society. IUCN presented the IUCN Green List of Well-Managed Protected Areas. It is a

methodology where the site must be assessed at national level, and is required to have a participatory process. This gives credibility to the whole management process. As Poland pointed out, it is not about the credibility of the List, but the credibility of the Convention. ICOMOS emphasized the importance of an implementation authority positioned within the existing management system in place. The integrated management of WH is the focus in the new regional capacity building programme by IUCN and ICCROM in collaboration with ICOMOS aiming at enhancing the collaboration between cultural and natural heritage professionals and a more effective implementation the WH Convention.

DISCUSSION PLATFORM:

From National Programmes to a World Heritage Programming approach: using the Periodic Reporting in support of the implementing of the '5C:s' Strategic Objectives

1C: CREDIBILITY

The Periodic Reporting exercise as an opportunity to implement measures towards making the World Heritage List more representative, balanced and credible

Issues: Periodic Reporting as an opportunity to:

- Complete / update national inventories and improve national site nomination policy,
- Revise the Tentative list using the Gap Analysis and Thematic Studies,
- Analyze and improve nomination process and analyze data concerning inscribed WH properties (boundaries, name changes, revision of criteria)

Revision of the Tentative Lists

The participants underlined that the work with tentative lists requires more capacity building on *World Heritage basic concepts*, in particular on The Outstanding Universal Value. There is also a need for a new thinking of categories, especially cultural landscapes. IUCN pointed out that thematic studies are part of credibility. There has been important work done with, for example marine sites and serial sites in this aspect. The advice is to rely on the existing tentative lists and make them more credible.

Another issue discussed was that the perceptions and motivations by the different responsible authorities and experts may differ - and the public often takes the World Heritage label as a marketing instrument. For example, in 2011 Georgia made a revision of the tentative list by distributing questionnaires to heritage specialists and the public. 99 % of the answers were in favor for cultural sites e.g. monuments, which is an indication that there are challenges to be met working towards a broader understanding of heritage. The lack of interest of local authorities was a common issue.

Several States Parties have put in *place a system for evaluation of tentative list inscriptions* involving local authorities. Poland presented their work where the Polish National Commission revises the tentative lists twice a year. A revision of the criteria is urgent. Many of the countries followed a set procedure for the nominations for the Tentative List, even if it was not always formally established. Croatia brought up the need to have a pre-evaluation, which may assist State Parties for further nomination process.

The institutional collaboration has been strengthened, as in the Czech Republic where The National Heritage Institute (in collaboration with the Czech National Committee of ICOMOS)

has currently proposed a mechanism, which determines the way of identifying sites for the national Tentative List. This includes ICOMOS, professional organizations and also takes into account the Scientific Council of the General Directorate of the National Heritage Institute. This mechanism is now waiting for an approval of the Czech Ministry of Culture. The collaboration between national ICOMOS and UNESCO National Commission is being developed in Slovenia as well. However, the lack of human and financial resources for working with tentative lists was a common problem.

International cooperation and transnational nominations

Czech Republic experiences show that *World Heritage is a good platform for international cooperation*. They have a special international expert group to help with nominations. Hungary reported that work with the large transnational serial nomination helps in developing comparative studies and a deepened understanding of The Outstanding Universal Value. Hungary is working with communities in the region and intends to profit from the EU Danube region synergies and resources. In Hungary only there are 100 municipalities and all were contacted; local forums and formal agreements have already been established. An information brochure of what it means to be on the tentative list was distributed to all stakeholders and the public.

Several experiences from inscribed *transnational properties show that the management systems required for these have increased the management capacities in the sites*. There are several current activities in the region, which link other conventions to World Heritage in the region; for example the joint working group within the Alpine Convention. The difficulties in information exchange, especially regarding language are important to take into consideration in planning activities.

Preparing nominations

The participants emphasized *the importance of working with nominations at site level*, not only with (external) experts. 'They (site) know how to do it better – and it is a benefit for the site', according to Polish experiences. Ukraine has good experiences of joint work with local universities where the local enthusiasm was a driving force. However, as Slovakia pointed out, at a certain point an expert is needed. Participants recognized the difficulties to raise interest at local level, especially with tentative lists and the need to include awareness building and capacity building activities early in the process. In general, the sites need support and there is a lack of capacity to develop nomination dossiers. Advice given was to clarify and establish roles and responsibilities - and be aware of the costs of nominating a site.

The complex issue of *involving religious communities* in the nomination process was brought up and should be given further attention. The recent meetings on religious communities and living heritage (Kyiv, Ukraine 2010 and Røros, Norway 2012) stressed the necessity of a shared dialogue.

2C: Conservation

Periodic Reporting exercise as a tool for more effective long –term conservation of World Heritage properties

Issues: Periodic Reporting as an opportunity to

- *Implement appropriate legal, administrative and financial measures*
- *Adopt new laws and regulations to strengthen heritage protection or ensure their systematic application*
- *Establish institutional coordination systems*
- *Establish integrated management process for WH properties and give legal meaning to WH Management plans*
- *Ensure regular and systematic monitoring of the overall state of conservation of properties*

Legal and institutional frameworks

The participants reported from current *updates of legal and institutional systems*. Serbia reminded from a key result from the 1st cycle of the Periodic Reporting: the importance of aligning management plans with current spatial plans; management plans are not legal instruments. ICOMOS pointed out that the Periodic Reporting gives a good opportunity for national initiatives; for example, the new French cultural heritage legislation was a result from the 1st PR cycle.

Slovakia informed that all sites had updated their management systems. Czech Republic has a special program for World Heritage sites – and all sites have management plans with a steering group. The Czech Ministry of Culture has just finalized the draft of a new Law on National Heritage Conservation. This proposal takes in account the World Heritage and defines principles and mechanisms in relation to it. The ministry had the National Heritage Institute elaborate a Recommended Structure of the Management Plan for this purpose. In Serbia, ICOM is a legal institution, and Hungary has special World Heritage legislation (please see details below). Russian Federation is currently planning seminars about World Heritage legislation.

Natural heritage is generally acknowledged in new national sustainable development strategies and policies, and cultural heritage is seen as a development factor in many cases. For example in Bosnia- Herzegovina cultural tourism is part of the development strategies. In Bulgaria the National Spatial Development Concept includes funding for projects concerning World Heritage sites. In Slovenia, Croatia, among others, the World Heritage status can also give a priority in tenders and calls for EU and other international programs. Poland presented their work with focal points and the national Committee for World Heritage, which organizes regular meetings and establishes priorities for World Heritage sites in funding from public sources.

The participants highlighted the need for more institutional and inter-ministerial cooperation and joint work on national and site level, as Croatia said, ‘needed to encourage rethinking on the greatest pressures to the site and finding possible solutions’.

The Ministry of Culture of Ukraine has developed a Draft Law of Ukraine “On Amendments to some Legislative Acts of Ukraine on Cultural Heritage. In addition, a new Law “On the National Cultural Heritage” is developed (it is at the stage of approval), in which an entire

chapter is devoted to the World Heritage. In Slovakia the Commission for Coordination of Tasks of the World Cultural Heritage Protection have been reestablished – this is a special body established for the World Cultural Heritage sites only and has an advisory function for the Minister of Culture. Its members are from ten ministries, managing groups of the WH sites, representatives from local self-governments, NGOS and ICOMOS Slovakia.

In general, there is a need for updating legal instruments to face today's conservation challenges. The participants agreed that a meeting focusing on World Heritage and legal issues would be useful.

Dr Gabor Soos from Hungary presented their new legislation on World Heritage. It was found an important step forward and its implementation will show how it will profit site management.

Some key points from the presentation of the new Hungarian legislation on World Heritage. Please consult the Periodic Reporting website. Additional information:
vilagorokseg.hu/portal/hungarian_act:phd

The Hungarian World Heritage legislation is not meant to be a model, it is the implementation, which will prove its usefulness. The main focus is on its proactive and integrated role including the socio-economic integration.

Some main features:

- Three levels of stakeholders are identified: 1) responsible, 2) bearing the costs, 3) benefiting and enjoying.
- All management plans have a legal status, which makes it possible to integrate fiscal tools
- World Heritage territory is defined as WHS + BZ and there is a unified legislation allowing for integration with other legislations
- A complex Impact Assessment is required, financed by the government, based on the Management Plan. Socio-economic measures are included.
- Implementation is assured by five governmental decrees
- UNESCO and Hungary have signed a Memorandum of Understanding

The status of Focal Points in developing new institutional and heritage frameworks

An issue, shared by many, is that Focal Points are not included in the preparation of new legislations. World Heritage Centre could urge the national authorities to include the focal points in the legal revision process. *It was agreed that the status of the focal points should be enhanced.*

The participants found some difficulties in engaging national authorities / ministries *in regional strategy development.* Another issue is the lack of institutional support as current reorganization of heritage legal systems has weakened the role of institutions and puts more emphasis on the expert roles.

Monitoring

Different ways of setting up *annual monitoring systems* were presented. For example, Slovakia has a special fund in the Ministry of Culture also for the monitoring the state of

conservation of the cultural sites. Georgia is in the process of setting up an annual action plan for monitoring. In Czech Republic the monitoring is a special system of annual monitoring by the national institute of heritage. They meet twice a year about preparation of final reports and updating on meetings and new documents. Armenia highlighted the need for developing indicators for monitoring.

Management effectiveness

The decision-making structure and the responsibilities in *the implementation of management plans* was an overarching issue. In Hungary there is a national World Heritage commission, with a sub-commission as advisory body of Ministry of Culture. Lessons learnt are that it is better to get together all actors in order to avoid conflicts.

ICOMOS reminded to keep in mind the feasibility of all management actions regarding local community capacity. The methodology and techniques and especially funding must be aligned with the existing local systems in order to be successfully implemented.

3C: CAPACITY BUILDING

Periodic Reporting exercise as a capacity building tool; promotion of the development of effective Capacity Building measures

The capacity building needs were widely discussed under all sessions. In addition, the participants have been asked to provide World Heritage Centre with documents and information concerning the national workshops already organised and/or planned for the site managers within the framework of the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise. All relevant documents and information regarding these national workshops available in national language, as well as a short summary notes with main recommendations that would be prepared in English could be shared among all Focal Points using our World Heritage Periodic Reporting Platform.

WHC reminded of the capacity draft reference questionnaires, which will help to elaborate the new three level World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy.

The participants reported from current capacity building activities ranging from regional cooperation to training seminars on World Heritage. Periodic Reporting is an effective capacity building tool, but, as pointed out by Poland, it should be followed by a precisely targeted training. Slovenia reminded that a special target group is newly appointed site managers. The coordination between international partners with serial nominations requires specific capacity building. Long-term training in the field of World Heritage is provided by Academy Istropolitana Nova in Slovakia, Summer University by Visegrad countries cooperation and a fairly large number of specific new university programmes. Bosnia - Herzegovina pointed out that there is usually little capacity building available for people living in or around World Heritage sites, and their involvement can be a significant resource for the site.

There is a need for sharing best practice and thematic courses like ICCROM's First Aid to Cultural Heritage in Times of Conflict, Heritage Impact Assessments and Disaster Risk Management. IUCN is working with a need assessment and plan to organize meetings on capacity building in the region, in Moldova, Ukraine, for example. The new World Heritage

Resource Manual on Managing Natural Heritage (2012) was presented. A Resource Manual on Cultural Heritage is expected to be published in 2013.

PROPOSAL FOR A STEERING COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING

The World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy foresees each UNESCO region developing a regional capacity building strategy and associated programmes for strengthening capacities at the regional level. This strategy will be different for each region in order to respond to the specific needs and situations in each of the regions. In order to launch this activity which is aligned with the Periodic Reporting exercise in the region World Heritage Centre proposed to establish a steering committee and asked for interests and suggestions of which training institutions can be interested to take on board this exercise. The needs are already identified and the steering group will be able to set priorities. The Advisory Bodies will assist the steering group.

Poland welcomed the idea of a steering group. There is UNESCO Chair in Heritage and Urban Studies (803), established in 2008 at Cracow University of Economics, Cracow, (Poland) and the university of Lublin has some programs on World Heritage. Slovakia expressed their interest as the Academia Istropolitana Nova (AI Nova) and Monuments Board has a long experience in World Heritage training. Hungary has an International Centre for Heritage.

The next steps are to agree on the members of the steering committee and then study capacities and funding. It is not a formal group, but a reflection group of experts and representatives from three sub-regions. Suggested time frame is a conference call in January and an outline before the World Heritage Committee meeting in June 2013.

The volunteers for the steering committee were the following (taking note that the participants cannot commit the State Parties to finance the participation) : Focal Points from Czech Republic, Georgia, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia and Ukraine.

The World Heritage Centre will be in contact for further activities.

4c Communication

Periodic Reporting as an opportunity to improve public awareness, involvement and support for World Heritage through communication

5C Community Involvement

Periodic Reporting as an opportunity to reinforce the involvement of local communities in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention

Periodic Reporting as an opportunity to improve public awareness, involvement and support for WH through Communication. Issues can include.

- *Is World Heritage status adequately marked and promoted on site?*
- *How to use PR as an opportunity to raise public awareness*
- *Have national, public and private foundations or NGOs been established to contribute to the protection of the WH?*

The issues of communication and community involvement are interlinked and therefore discussed and reported jointly.

ICOMOS stressed that it is crucial *to identify who the communities are*. For example; 1st level: organizations and 2nd level inhabitants. We must get together these actors! IUCN highlighted that a stakeholder analysis is part of the process of mobilizing the community. In this Periodic Reporting process can have the same function. Local actors are not the same as public at large, as Hungary reminded and brought up the issue that the task to address public at large requires more resources and different approaches. The involvement of religious communities is an important question in the region, and the Kyiv conference in 2011 was one of the first ones to address the issue.

The overall assessment was that *communication and negotiations skills* would need more attention, and the World Heritage Centre should focus more on the topic. Armenia has approached ICCROM for thematic ICCROM courses heritage in times of conflict. Croatia pointed out that there is a need for basic information on community level on the different UNESCO Conventions. The involvement of the local community in site management activities – and in celebrations - is essential. Periodic Reporting is a good opportunity – ask community to be a part of the team. Czech Republic suggested that site managers could be encouraged to involve public in their activities and popularize the results from, for example Periodic Reporting and Slovenia informed about their plans for a series of lectures and presentations starting in January. However, several participants stressed the fact that Periodic Reporting is a State driven activity, which has a set timetable. The local community should be informed about its purpose and process.

Belarus pointed out that tourism promotion could disregard the local community. Periodic Reporting results can be used to change the attitudes. Ukraine's recent experiences from working with the local community were positive; inhabitants, private foundations and NGOs were involved. The state organization Czech Tourism has an individual strategy for the World Heritage and the properties themselves have a common association, which is called "UNESCO Czech Heritage" and serves for the promotion of the Czech World Heritage properties. Bosnia - Herzegovina reported from the successful work in Mostar World Heritage site where the City Council has established a responsible agency that works in close cooperation with other institutions and the local community. The National Parks have a special situation, as most of the employees belong to the local communities, as Croatia pointed out.

Georgia's recent experience to establish a community representation in a World Heritage site steering committee revealed that no existing organizations could fit the objectives of the management plan. NGOs and ICOMOS Georgia had to take on the tasks. This illustrates that the local community is not always organized or has little knowledge how to participate in decision-making processes even if the local councils can here have a role. Poland reported that after the meeting the Questionnaire was translated and comments were asked from World Heritage site representatives. No single reply has been received – this kind of strategic work is felt as additional and 'bureaucratic'. Successful experiences highlight the role of mayors as well as media. Youth forums, summer schools for local children, for example in Moldova have had very positive effects on heritage appraisal. Georgia has published a brochure that explains the importance of World Heritage to the public.

Poland reminded of some key issues for raising community awareness: It is important to keep in mind that

1. What the sites are doing is not only 'their business' nor only of national interest– the international focus should be stressed
2. Conservation and human rights are an important issue to take into consideration
3. Community is part of conservation and education activities – learn from communities!

ICOMOS representative Isabelle Longuet is also site manager for the French World Heritage property Loire Valley. She shared her experiences from working with 190 local authorities involved in the Action Plans. Slovakia reported how the local community opinion changed during the preparation of the nomination, and consequently the management approach was changed.

Ms Petya Totcharova, World Heritage Center, concluded by reminding of the need for capacity building to understand and identify community. The Final Conference celebrating World Heritage 40 year's anniversary in Kyoto, agreed on a 'Kyoto Vision' including two issues; capacity building and community appropriation.

Please consult the Periodic Reporting website for the workshop programme, participant list and all presentations and documents :
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/958/>

Note:

The participants were asked to fill the questionnaire and exchange information on the existing national level measures and instruments for protection, conservation, monitoring and management of the World Heritage properties, and more particularly by providing examples / case-studies such as:

- *Development and implementation of National Heritage Strategies, Policies and/or Programmes related to the sustainable protection of cultural and natural heritage;*
- *Preparation and adoption of protective legislation for World Heritage;*
- *Establishment of management systems and decision-making mechanisms;*
- *Establishment of coordination with the site managers;*
- *Involvement of the local communities;*
- *Participation in the implementation of the World Heritage capacity building strategy by organising training and awareness raising activities to strengthen the capacities of the stakeholders involved in the implementation of the Convention;*