

## **Second Cycle of the World Heritage Periodic Reporting for Europe**

### **Workshop for Nordic-Baltic sub-region Drafting of Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value**

**4-6 October 2010  
Tallinn, Estonia**

## **Report**

**By the Nordic World Heritage Foundation  
Ole S e Eriksen**

### **Introduction**

Recalling Decision 23.COM/11E and the Action Plan following the Nordic-Baltic Periodic Reporting Meeting in Stockholm 9 December 2009, the workshop was organised as part of the sub-regional preparations leading up to the second cycle of Periodic Reporting in Europe, to be launched 1 January 2012. The eight States Parties of the sub-region identified the need for capacity-building and training for completion of the Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value (SoOUV) prior to launching the second cycle of Periodic Reporting in Europe, and requested NWHF to prepare and facilitate a workshop in this regard. The objective of the two-day workshop was to provide the participants with methodological tools for preparation of SoOUVs through hands-on training and experience in the drafting process with feedback and advice from the Advisory Bodies. Thanks to the generous financial contributions of the Estonian National Commission for UNESCO, Tallinn Cultural Heritage Department, IUCN and NWHF the workshop benefitted from capacity-building and expert advice provided by Susan Denyer of ICOMOS and Leticia Leita of IUCN.

Hosted by the Estonian National Commission for UNESCO in cooperation with the Tallinn Cultural Heritage Department and facilitated and chaired by the Nordic World Heritage Foundation (NWHF), the workshop gathered a total of 31 World Heritage Focal Points and specialists from the eight countries in the sub-region, ICOMOS, IUCN and an observer from the Western-Europe sub-region.

### **Methodology**

The workshop methodology comprised a series of theoretical presentations on the different sections of the statements (Criteria; Authenticity and Integrity; Protection and Management, Long-term expectations, Brief Synthesis), followed by practical work related to these and plenary presentations and discussions. The participants worked with statements for one or

more properties in their respective countries. The workshop resulted in preparation of draft SoOUVs for Kronborg Castle, Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn, Old Rauma (and revision of drafts for other Finnish WH sites), Historic Centre of Riga, Thingvellir National Park, Struve Geodetic Arc, West Norwegian Fjords and Bryggen in Bergen. In addition, several Swedish World Heritage sites and the transnational sites Curonian Spit and High Coast/Kvarken Archipelago were discussed. The individual exercises allowed each participant to get expert advice and feedback on at least one draft statement from each country. The workshop also provided the opportunity to examine and discuss in-depth the nomination dossiers, Advisory Bodies' evaluations and other documentation for the individual sites. Finally, the participants considered the workshop an opportunity to learn more about Periodic Reporting and World Heritage processes in general. The plenary presentations of draft statements in progress allowed for peer review and feedback from the Advisory Bodies.

### **Issues arising through presentations and discussions**

The presentations provided knowledge of what Outstanding Universal Value is, why the statements are important and what they will be used for. One important aspect of this is that the statements will be used both by the wider World Heritage community (WHC, ABs, States Parties, Focal Points, Site Managers, other experts) and also by the more general public. Further, examples of good statements were given, including tips on how to write "good" statement and advice concerning the style and complexity of the language. When it comes to language, precision is a key word, and it is also important to avoid repetitions. It was also emphasised that the statements should be descriptive rather than pure summaries of the sites, and that a good statement should create an image of the site for the reader by explaining its values, attributes, location etc. The statements should both answer WHAT the site is, and WHY it is important and was given the World Heritage status.

### **Synthesis of issues discussed during the presentations and working sessions:**

Can the available information be "improved" in the statements?

Values and attributes cannot be changed. Rather, it is important to clarify what the site is, and secondly, why it is significant. It is also important to make the statement as useful as possible, underpinned by what was available at the time of inscription. If information strengthening the justification for criteria and OUV is available, it should be included and added – if it reinforces the value already recognised. It is very important to emphasise that values which were not recognised initially cannot be added.

Related to the previous issue, the section on Criteria (how to present it and what sources to use) was a recurring issue:

The Advisory Bodies stressed the importance of using the sources – if they are available. It is also crucial to remember the hierarchy of sources and use the "best" available – first the Committee decision, secondly the Advisory Body evaluation(s) and thirdly the Nomination dossier. If the Committee decision is available it must be used, if not there is more room for "liberties".

How to cope with factual errors, incomplete and contradicting information in the nomination files and other relevant sources?

Perpetuating these errors is not something that is desirable. The SoOUVs are an opportunity to correct such errors. In submitting the statement it is necessary to explain what has been done and why.

Dates – deadlines. A certain confusion exists as to what are the actual deadlines for submitting the SoOUVs. The Advisory Bodies made it clear that they have a backlog of statements. The SoOUVs should intentionally have been prepared in advance, but the reality is something else. Decision 34.COM/10B.3, stating that the deadline for Europe is 1 February 2012, was presented to the participants.

Workload/time used for preparing the SOUVs?

The Advisory Bodies made it clear that this varies a lot, and further that it depends on what is helpful for Focal Points/Site Managers and what will give the best results. The local levels should be involved so that the adopted statements do not come as surprises. This exercise is not only about compiling the necessary information. The Site Managers (and other stakeholders) should be involved as they know the sites and their specific needs.

Should only the brief synthesis be “readable” and the rest kept technical?

ICOMOS held the opinion that the whole statement should be readable for all audiences, as a communication tool. IUCN added that obviously technical language will be necessary, but also that it is important to try to keep in mind that the statements should be available to the general public, and not only the brief synthesis.

How should authenticity and integrity be presented for sites which have been extended since inscription? Should both the state at inscription and as of today be elaborated on, or only as of today?

ICOMOS advised that such sites should be described and explained based on the current status.

Archaeological sites – how should they be described when they have been subjected to excavations and covered up again?

Such sites are always challenging, how can their OUV be conveyed? How far can the site convey its OUV – are the artefacts of the excavation critical in this regard, or is it their associations, the setting etc. which is critical? All these aspects need to be taken into consideration for such sites.

Buffer zones – is it possible to write in the statements that they are in place when they are in practice, but not approved by the Committee?

It cannot be stated in the SoOUVs, but it is possible to say that they have been elaborated on and need adoption. Further, buffer zones are defined as a minor modification, only requiring a new map and short description to be adopted.

What should be focused in the section for Management and Protection?

Most States Parties considered that this section could be completed by listing all legal mechanisms in place. The Advisory Bodies recommended that the key instruments which are being used should be stressed AND put into context – “relating the site to

the problem(s) to the corresponding rule(s) and measure(s)”. This section proved challenging, as only listing the legal measures in place is not sufficient.

Protection and Management – should it be presented as it was at the time of nomination, today, or focus on what is expected in future?

The Advisory Bodies answered this question in the presentations targeted towards these areas and emphasised that what is relevant is the state of affairs as of today. However, it was evident that certain confusions exist among Focal Points and Site Managers.

### **Workshop evaluation: Participants’ feedback**

- The workshop methodology was generally considered very effective in allowing the participants to concentrate fully on the different sections with continuous feedback from colleagues and advice from Advisory Bodies. Further, through this approach the participants had to employ directly what they had learnt from the presentations which secured active participation.
- The plenary presentations of the different sections of the drafts were considered important as it allowed for clarifying comments and perspectives from professionals not knowing in detail the sites outside their own countries, which again helped the participants with communicating the values of their sites to “outsiders”.
- The presentations from ICOMOS, IUCN and NWHF were considered very useful and important. Information provided in such sessions should be very clear, concise and to the point, with ample use of good examples.
- It is very important that the learning sessions not only provides theoretical and practical insight of the drafting process but also informs of the broader use of the SoOUVs after Committee approval.
- The best prepared participants reported the best outcomes and were most satisfied with the sessions. Hence, the participants should be encouraged strongly to:
  - read all guidance materials carefully in advance.
  - prepare draft statements in advance.
  - bring all necessary documentation to compile a draft statement.
- For such a workshop to be effective, good internet connections to access the documentation found on the WHC website (and others) are crucial for both the participants and the Advisory Bodies.

## Challenges:

- how to secure follow-up nationally?
- how to secure that all participants get the feedback and advice they want and expect in such workshops?
  - o This was attempted solved through the plenary presentations.
  - o At the same time, this part of the exercise is very time-consuming and easily turns into a discussion between the participant and Advisory Body. Several participants commented that “the loudest voices got most attention”. This was particularly a challenge for the cultural sites as these were overrepresented in the workshop. This session could potentially be organised differently (f.ex. in groups, but this necessitates more experts to provide feedback and advice).
- how to secure adhesion and commitment in this and related PR processes?

## Recommendations from the States Parties in the future work:

- Sub-regional meetings and workshops are very important in preparing and motivating the Focal Points for the necessary work and further capacity building nationally.
- At the same time, the importance of organising capacity building also for site managers and other involved staff (i.e. not only target States Parties/Focal Points) was emphasised.
- Clear communication of deadlines to States Parties is crucial (the initial 1 February 2011 deadline was postponed to 1 February 2012 in decision 34.COM/10B.3)
- The States Parties ask for access to the questionnaires as early as possible to be able to start working on them and to secure the necessary attention and prioritisation at higher national level (necessary with awareness-raising at both political and responsible ministerial level).
- All information and training materials should be easily available on the web for future reference and work.



**Ole Sør Eriksen**  
**Programme Officer**  
**Nordic World Heritage Foundation**



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization



**Nordic World Heritage Foundation**  
under the auspices of UNESCO

## **Annexes:**

Workshop Programme

List of participants

[OUV Guidance Manual \(WHC, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN\)](#)

Presentations:

[Introduction: PR in Europe and the Nordic-Baltic region \(NWHF\)](#)

[Introduction SoOUV \(ICOMOS\)](#)

[Introduction SoOUV \(IUCN\)](#)

[Criteria, Authenticity, Integrity, Management&Protection \(ICOMOS\)](#)

[Criteria \(IUCN\)](#)

[Integrity \(IUCN\)](#)

[Management&Protection \(IUCN\)](#)



## Programme

### Nordic-Baltic region Focal Point workshop on preparation of draft Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value, Tallinn, 4-6 October 2010.

#### Monday 4 October

19.00 Reception at Tallinn Cultural Heritage Department (Raekoja Square 12)

#### Tuesday 5 October

- 08.30 Registration and Coffee  
09.00 Official Opening, Prof Mart Kalm  
09.10 Introductory remarks on the PR process and the preparations leading up to the second cycle PR, Discussion – planning the work, WHC/EUR or NWHF.  
09.30 ICOMOS: preparing draft Retrospective Statements of OUV for cultural WH properties, experiences from other regions (20min), including Q&A (10min)  
10.00 IUCN: preparing draft Retrospective Statements of OUV for natural WH properties, experiences from other regions (20min), including Q&A (10min).  
10.30 City walk: Tallinn Old Town – in search of the OUV in Historic Urban Landscapes (Case study).  
12.30 Lunch.  
13.30 Work Session: Criteria – Introduction by ICOMOS/IUCN, Individual/group work.  
16.00 Coffee break.  
16.30 Work Session: Authenticity and Integrity – Introduction by ICOMOS/IUCN, Individual/group work.  
19.00 5 min presentations of the work so far – peer review – comments and feedback.  
20.00 End. Free evening.

#### Wednesday 6 October

- 08.30 Work session: Protection and Management, Long-term expectations, Brief Synthesis – Introduction by ICOMOS/IUCN, Individual/group work.  
10.00 Coffee Break.  
10.15 Work session: Protection and Management, Long-term expectations, Brief Synthesis – Continued.  
12.00 Lunch  
13.00 Work session: ABs available for consultancy (or: if progress is good, groupwork on Struve and mixed sites?)  
14.30 5 min presentations of final drafts – peer review – comments and feedback.  
15.30 Wrapping up, discussion on the way forward, how can we make our experiences useful for other colleagues?  
16.00 Closure of the workshop.  
Farewell coffee.

**Participant list Nordic-Baltic Focal Point Workshop on St. of OUV Tallinn 4-6 October 2010**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
<b>Denmark</b>	Bolette Lehn Petersen Charlotte Valerius	blehnp@kulturarv.dk chaval@kulturarv.dk	Architect Head of section, Conservation	Heritage Agency of Denmark Heritage Agency of Denmark
<b>Estonia</b>	Anneli Randla Henry Kuningas Karin Kollo Liina Jänes Margit Siim Mari Loit Marika Valk Mark Sepp Mart Kalm Nele Ingerpuu Riin Alatalu Urve Sinijärv Ülle Reier	anneli.randla@gmail.com henry.kuningas@tallinnlv.ee karin.kollo@maaamet.ee liina.janes@tallinnlv.ee margit.siim@unesco.ee mari.loit@muinas.ee marika.valk@unesco.ee mark.sepp@tallinnlv.ee mart.kalm@artun.ee nele.ingerpuu@ut.ee riin.alatalu@tallinnlv.ee urve.sinijarv@envir.ee ulle.reier@ut.ee	Associate Professor Chief Specialist Chief Specialist; Struve contact point Focal Point Coordinator of Culture Programmes Advisor on heritage conservation Secretary-General Head of Division Dean of the Faculty of Art and Culture Senior Researcher Head of Division Focal Point Nature; Chief Specialist Researcher	Dep. of Conservation and Cultural Heritage, Estonian Academy of Art Heritage Protection Division, Cultural Heritage Dept, Tallinn City Gvmt. Department of Geodesy, Estonian Land Board Heritage Protection Division, Cultural Heritage Dept, Tallinn City Gvmt. Estonian National Commission for UNESCO Estonian National Heritage Board Estonian National Commission for UNESCO Development Department, City Council, Tallinn City Government Estonian Academy of Art Institute of Ecology and Earth Sciences, Dept of Botany, University of Tartu Division of Milieu Areas, Cultural Heritage Dept, Tallinn City Government Nature Conservation Department, Ministry of Environment Institute of Ecology and Earth Sciences, Dept of Botany, University of Tartu
<b>Finland</b>	Sirkkaliisa Jetsonen	Sirkkaliisa.jetsonen@nba.fi	Architect	National Board of Antiquities
<b>Iceland</b>	Ragnheidur Thorarinsdottir Sigurdur Thrainsson	ragnheidur.h.thorarinsdottir@mrn.stjr.is sigurdur.thrainsson@umh.stjr.is	Focal Point Nature Focal Point Culture	Ministry of Education, Science and Culture Ministry of Environment
<b>Latvia</b>	Anita Vaivade Jānis Zilgalvis	anita@unesco.lv janis.zilgalvis@mantojums.lv	CCIP Director Head of Architecture Department	Latvian National Commission for UNESCO State Inspection for Heritage Protection
<b>Lithuania</b>	Algimantas Degutis Ruta Baskyte	alde@heritage.lt r.baskyte@vstt.lt	Focal Point Nature Focal Point Culture	Cultural Heritage Department under the Ministry of Culture State Protected Area Service under the Ministry of Environment
<b>Norway</b>	Gaute Sønstebo Lisen Roll Trond Taugbøl	gaute.sonstebo@dirnat.no lisen.roll@ra.no trond.taugbol@ra.no	Focal Point Nature Focal Point Culture Focal Point Culture	Directorate for Nature Management, Norway Riksantikvaren, Directorate for Cultural Heritage, Norway Riksantikvaren, Directorate for Cultural Heritage, Norway
<b>Sweden</b>	Margareta Gavatin Maria Wikman	margareta.gavatin@raa.se maria.wikman@raa.se	Focal Point Culture	Swedish National Heritage Board Swedish National Heritage Board
<b>ICOMOS</b>	Susan Denyer	susan.denyers@denyers.net	World Heritage Adviser	ICOMOS
<b>IUCN</b>	Leticia Leitao	leticia.leitao@iucn.org	World Heritage Capacity Building Officer	IUCN
<b>NWHF</b>	Ole Søre Eriksen	ose@nwhf.no	Programme Officer/Adviser	Nordic World Heritage Foundation
<b>Observer</b>	Carol Westrik	cwestrik@unesco.nl	Programme Officer	Netherlands National Commission for UNESCO