

Report on the
Meeting of the Mediterranean European Focal Points for World Heritage

Florence (Italy), 16 – 19 September 2013



SUMMARY

The meeting gathered National Focal Points of Mediterranean Europe, and was generously hosted by Italy and co-organized by the World Heritage Centre.

The meeting focused on the implementation of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting for Europe and North America and was designed as a practical training session on the usage of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire. It aimed to prepare the National Focal Points for the organization of national workshops with national authorities and Site Managers, in order to facilitate the completion of the Periodic Reporting online questionnaire, thereby ensuring capacity building and involvement of stakeholders at national level.

The meeting was also an opportunity to brief the Focal Points about the current status and process concerning the preparation of retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value and activities related to the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy.

Summary of the Meeting

Day 1 - Tuesday, 17 September 2013

Introductory remarks by the Italian Authorities, Advisory Bodies, World Heritage Centre

Appropriation of Periodic Reporting on national and site levels – challenges and benefits

Young, Christopher (Focal Point of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

Totcharova, Petya (Chief of Europe and North America Unit, UNESCO World Heritage Centre)

Maraña, Maider (UNESCO World Heritage Centre)

After the participants' presentation in the introductory round, Petya Totcharova clarified the meaning of "appropriation" of the Periodic Reporting exercise, defining it as an instrument providing data for better management and policy making at the national level. In particular, she pointed out that the States Parties are the final beneficiaries of the exercise, which should, therefore, increasingly evolve into a State Party driven process ensuring a higher level of involvement of stakeholders at national level in the implementation of the results of Periodic Reporting. The States Parties are encouraged to use the outcomes of the questionnaire for developing or adjusting World Heritage-related strategies, etc.

Maider Maraña reminded the participants of the main lessons learnt of Group A at the national level that were presented at the Periodic Reporting Information and Exchange meeting during the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee in Cambodia (June 2013), such as those concerning the mechanisms for training and selecting site managers, especially in the case of transboundary properties; the issue of filling the questionnaire before the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been approved by the Committee; the sharing of considerations when dealing with factors affecting the property; and other practical tips for addressing issues related to the Periodic Reporting exercise.

Christopher Young shared with the participants his experience with the Periodic Reporting exercise as Focal Point of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, providing examples and pointing out the various roles and activities involved. In particular, he referred to the coordination mechanisms and the training modalities adopted (also involving ICOMOS UK), as well as the role of the Focal Point in the validation of the questionnaires, especially when a site manager has difficulty interpreting questions or requires assistance in properly using the questionnaire.

Special focus was given to transnational and/or serial properties where a coordinator was nominated to negotiate, find a middle ground and balance feedback provided by the representatives of the different components of the properties when these had diverging opinions.

Mr Young explained that Section I was also sometimes challenging to fill in given the different governing entities in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Furthermore, he listed the main issues raised in the exercise, namely the interpretation of some questions, the limited range of options, the evaluation of potential threats, and the insufficient space provided in the comments boxes.

Finally, Mr Young outlined the national strategy for the appropriation of the results of the Periodic Reporting exercise, which envisages a national report on *Challenges and Opportunities* and the identification of strategic gaps that the Periodic Reporting exercise could help to illustrate, all the while offering a fruitful ground for cooperation among site managers. In this respect, he suggested that the Focal Points think well in advance about the expected use of the data, in order to better coordinate the site managers' answers and provide them with guidelines for using the comments box that could better assist the final analysis of the data collected.

Discussion

Totcharova, Petya (Chief of Europe and North America Unit, World Heritage Centre)

Søe Eriksen, Ole (Nordic World Heritage Foundation)

De Marco, Luisa (ICOMOS)

Galland, Pierre (IUCN)

Lisitzin, Katri (ICCROM)

Ole Søe Eriksen presented the experience of the Nordic Countries, highlighting the importance of the Focal Points' role in following up and integrating the input of all the actors in the exercise, through negotiation and procedural setting for inter-institutional coordination.

The Advisory Bodies commented on the discussion with preliminary remarks on the opportunity to use the exercise at the site level for capacity-building, thematic networking and bottom level support from more experienced to less experienced site managers (ICOMOS); to evaluate the risk of proliferation of strategic instruments and the relevance of monitoring as a substantial part of site management (IUCN); to integrate different administrative levels in an effort to improve cooperation; to move towards better informed decision-making processes using the valuable data collected during the PR exercise; and to identify capacity-building needs at national level (ICCROM).

It was also pointed out that there is a need for cross-regional cooperation networks beyond the sub-regional clusters.

Petya Totcharova suggested reviewing the results of the First Cycle of Periodic Reporting, which could help both the site managers and the Focal Points in carrying out the Second Cycle.

Questions & Answers

National Focal Points

De Marco, Luisa (ICOMOS)

Galland, Pierre (IUCN)

Lisitzin, Katri (ICCROM)

Fiebig, Alexandra (UNESCO World Heritage Centre)

Young, Christopher (Focal Point of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

The Q & A session mainly addressed issues relating to: the mechanisms and approaches adopted by the Focal Points to balance site managers' answers and information on threats, especially in the

case of serial properties; the evaluation of the potential threats; the reference to retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value, not yet adopted; clarifications on the requests of quality maps; guidance on monitoring indicators for the state of conservation; technical questions concerning the accessibility of the questionnaire, the baseline for answers and the timing for submission.

Q1. How can we balance the political and scientific emphasis given by some site managers in the answers?

A1: The subjectivity of the answers has to be accepted to a certain extent. However, it could be useful to use focus groups and concentrate on explaining the aim of the questions.

Q2. How can we encourage site managers to use the comments box, which provides the Focal Points with the rationale behind their choices?

A2: While at the global level trend analysis does not require comments, at the national and site levels, comments are essential for having baseline information and documentation. To this purpose, using the training session may be beneficial.

Q3. How can we evaluate the gravity and actuality of a threat (potential vs. current), for example in the case of earthquakes?

A3: The issue of earthquakes has been treated differently in different regions. As individuals may have diverging opinions on how to rate this type of threat, it is the role of the Focal Point to harmonize subjective judgments and overestimations and to address the issue in the training sessions. However, in order to minimize subjectivity, Focal Points can refer to a number of already existing databases in order to rate the levels of a threat, if no specific data is available on-site.

Q4: In the case of a serial property, how can we deal with a local threat that does not affect the property as a whole?

A4: Overall, this issue is not very different from what can happen in a large property, where localised threats may occur without having an impact on the property as a whole. However, within the questionnaire it is possible to flag that a local factor is negatively affecting the property, while indicating that it remains relatively "insignificant" with regards to the entire property.

Q5: When filling in the questionnaire, is it possible to refer to a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value that has not yet been adopted?

A5: The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is only pre-filled by the World Heritage Centre when it has been adopted by the World Heritage Centre. However, a Statement that has been drafted and is currently in the agreement phase between Advisory Bodies and the State Party can already be taken as a solid reference point as it provides a clear idea of the Outstanding Universal Value which in many cases will alter significantly. Thus while answering the questions, it is to be welcomed to refer to the draft of the retrospective Statement.

Q6: Is the State Party required to provide better quality maps?

A6: There are 3 main groups of properties: those inscribed before 1998 that went through the Retrospective Inventory process; those inscribed from 2007 onwards, whose maps are in line with the current standards (a strict completeness check was introduced in the *Operational Guidelines* for the submission of nominations in 2005); and those inscribed between 1999-2006, for which, in some cases, we have no adequate maps. As maps are

an essential tool for the evaluation of state of conservation cases, and in view of the possible shortage of funding for another retrospective inventory exercise, it is important to use the Second Cycle as an opportunity to provide better quality maps, complying with the current requirements, in the interest of better protecting the property.

Q7: Site managers asked Focal Points for advice on monitoring indicators for the state of conservation of the properties. Is there a good practice to which we may refer?

A7: Although there are fewer developed examples for cultural sites, ICOMOS has included some advice in the [Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties](#). That being said, having an Outstanding Universal Value implies the need to develop a unique monitoring system that includes a set of indicators, frequent data collection and sources of information. This can be a good example of the need for training at the national level.

Q8: Is it possible for Focal Points to be connected at the same time with the same password on different sites?

A8: There may be difficulties in working at the same time on the same questionnaire.

Q9: Which is the baseline for the answers?

A9: If the site has not been subject to the First Cycle of Periodic Reporting, the baseline is the time of inscription. Otherwise, the reference is the previous cycle of Periodic Reporting.

Technical training on the online questionnaire – Section I and Section II

The World Heritage Centre provided the participants with an overview of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire and the improvements made since the First Cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise, as a background to better understand the process and the technical features of the Second Cycle questionnaire. A practical training session on the Periodic Reporting platform was carried out, using an interactive and individual approach.

Link to the presentation: <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/events/documents/event-1075-3.pdf>

Wednesday, 18 September 2013

Showcasing national World Heritage initiatives

The participants were invited to present a national World Heritage initiative of their choice to the workshop participants in a 5 minute presentation. The presentations have been shared via file depot with the participants. Below is the list of presentations by order of speaking.

- 1. Greece:** Constantina Benissi and Vassiliki Dimitropoulou (Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports)
Topic: Initiatives for the accessibility to Greek World Heritage sites for disabled people
- 2. Israel:** Guy Kav Venaki (National World Heritage Committee)
Topic: The involvement of the Israeli monitoring team in statutory procedures, which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties
- 3. Italy:** Adele Cesi (Ufficio Patrimonio Mondiale UNESCO)
Topic: Managing World Heritage at national level: Opportunities and criticalities – the initiative taken at national level on the Periodic Reporting Exercise as well as others (national meetings, exhibitions, etc.)
- 4. Malta:** Maria Elena Zammit (National Museum of Archaeology)
Topic: “Limits of Acceptable Change”: studies for the Megalithic Temples
- 5. Portugal:** Luiz de Pinho Lopes (Direção-Geral do Património Cultural)
Topic: «Tourism Management at World Heritage Sites of Portuguese Origin and Influence (Tour-WHPO)».
Synopsis: « Preserving the values and spirit of the place while also providing socio-economic well-being and quality of life to its communities represents both an opportunity and a challenge to the World Heritage properties. Turismo de Portugal and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre have risen to this challenge to develop the project «Tourism Management at World Sites of Portuguese Origin and Influence (Tour-WHPO)» that features efficient heritage-sensitive approaches to visitor management at sites of Portuguese origin and influence.»
- 6. San Marino:** Marina Volpinari (Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Unit responsible for the management plan)
Topic: Various initiatives adopted by San Marino since 2008, year of inclusion in the List, in various fields, such as historical centre interventions, environmental measures, road and sign improvements, cultural initiatives
- 7. Spain:** Laura de Miguel Riera (Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport)
Topic: The programme “Youth Forum”, organised by the Spanish Ministry of Culture in the last five years: methodology, experience and results as an example of communication and participation of young people in the conservation of heritage
- 8. Turkey:** Seda Duzcu (Ministry of Culture and Tourism)
Topic: The community involvement process of Istanbul Historic Peninsula Site Management Plan

Special Focus – Statements of Outstanding Universal Value

De Marco, Luisa (ICOMOS)

Fiebig, Alexandra (World Heritage Centre, UNESCO)

Manz, Kerstin (World Heritage Centre, UNESCO)

Advisory Bodies

a) Process, timeline

The participants were briefed about the current status of the review progress of the retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value for the Mediterranean sub-region. All expected draft Statements for the sub-region have been submitted and considered complete and are currently under evaluation by the Advisory Bodies. In view of the phased approach for the evaluation of cultural retrospective Statements with the Advisory Body ICOMOS International, a total of 41 revised draft Statements will be sent to the Focal Points from the sub-region after 31 October 2013. Any Statements agreed and finalised between the State Party and the Advisory Bodies for the deadline of 1 March 2014 will be presented for the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee. Any Statements finalised after this date will go to the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee. The World Heritage Centre drew the attention of the participants to the latest decision of the World Heritage Committee concerning the use of gender neutral language and informed the Focal Points that all unnecessary time-bound references should be avoided within the Statement to keep it valid in the long-term future.

The process of agreeing on the final draft Statement between Advisory Bodies and the State Party, often entailing numerous exchanges over a longer period of time, was further discussed. It was stressed that this process should be considered as beneficial to the identification and addressing of potential threats to the Outstanding Universal Value. It may, in some cases, be preferable to work longer on the draft Statement in order to arrive at a Statement in the end that can serve as a basis for the adequate conservation and management of the World Heritage property.

b) Statements of Outstanding Universal Value as a basis for management systems and decision-making processes (WHC: K. Manz; and Luisa de Marco, ICOMOS, Advisory Bodies)

Luisa de Marco, ICOMOS, addressed the role of Statements of Outstanding Universal Value in the management and monitoring processes. She informed the participants of several projects and initiatives that had been carried out in Europe on the topic of management and monitoring of the Outstanding Universal Value of cultural properties, such as the EEA funded project entitled “*Improvement of the existing protection and management systems for sites inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List: Preparation of statements of Outstanding Universal Value and monitoring indicators, based on Norwegian and Polish experiences*”, or in the context of the preparation of the World Heritage Management Plan of the Loire Valley (France) and Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (UK)”. Ms de Marco explained how the respective texts of the criteria of different types of cultural World Heritage properties were analysed to highlight the significant attributes that serve as a basis for the identification of indicators that would guide the management and monitoring actions of those issues, threats and factors that affect the property. The above-mentioned research projects developed different levels of detail in the declination of attributes into indicators and characteristics, and subsequently into management goals and actions. As a final message, Ms de Marco underlined ICOMOS’ availability and willingness to provide guidance on these steps. She also encouraged the participants to consult the projects and documents mentioned during her presentation as useful references and sources of inspiration.

Ms Lisitzin, ICCROM, and Mr Galland, IUCN, added that a monitoring project is currently ongoing for natural World Heritage properties in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe. The participating partner sites are in the process of identifying good practices already existing at site level and defining common indicators for World Heritage monitoring for their properties.

Capacity Building: Global and sub-regional strategies resulting from the Periodic Reporting exercise

Fiebig, Alexandra (UNESCO World Heritage Centre)

Lisitzin, Katri (ICCROM)

Katri Lisitzin, ICCROM, reminded the participants of the main principles of the Global World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy, which aims at addressing a broad audience including individuals, communities and institutions and enabling them to sustainably manage and protect the World Heritage properties. Furthermore, Ms Lisitzin emphasized the importance and benefits of a joint management approach for cultural and natural properties and reminded the participants that various tools and initiatives were developed by other regions for capacity building, as part of the follow-up of their Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting.

It was stressed that the Periodic Reporting process should be used to identify and formulate capacity building needs, and the Periodic Reporting results to help bring capacity building initiatives – tailored to the specific needs of the World Heritage properties and the communities – to the attention of decision-makers and funding agencies.

Alexandra Fiebig then presented the sub-regional capacity building strategy initiative for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe as one of the possible approaches to the World Heritage capacity building activities. As a follow-up of the First Cycle of Periodic Reporting, the Europe and North America regional desk of the World Heritage Centre launched at the end of 2011 an initiative to elaborate a sub-regional capacity building strategy for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe region. A Steering Group was created on a voluntary basis with the participation of national Focal Points, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. In May 2013 the Steering Group finalized a Blueprint document for a future Capacity Building Strategy for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe which can be consulted at the following link: <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/events/documents/event-1054-2.pdf>

The next consultation meeting for capacity building initiatives is planned for the October 2013 Baku Periodic Reporting meeting, during which the next steps in the elaboration of a full-fledged strategy will be discussed by all the National Focal Points from the sub-region.

Ms Jane Thompson presented, on behalf of ICCROM, the “Management Cultural World Heritage” Manual, which will be published in autumn 2013.

Evaluation of the meeting

Evaluation forms were distributed to participants at the end of the workshop. All the participants gave high scores to the meeting in Florence (there was a medium of 4.5, using a scale from 1 to 5). For the content of the workshop, they highlighted that the training component (for the online questionnaire) was one of the most interesting parts. The possibility to discuss local and national level initiatives and exchange with Focal Points during the second day of the workshop was also very important for the participants.

PROGRAMME

Meeting of the Mediterranean European Focal Points for World Heritage

Florence (Italy), September 16 - 19, 2013

Monday, 16 September 2013

Morning: Arrival of participants

Afternoon: Possible Visit to the Cappella Brancacci (with vouchers)

FREE TIME

Tuesday, 17 September 2013

08.30 Registration

09.00/10.30 Introductory remarks (Italian Authorities, Advisory Bodies, WHC)

Introductory round of participants

10.30/10.45 Coffee-break

10.45/12.30 Appropriation of Periodic Reporting on national and site levels – challenges and benefits (Focal Point of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: Mr Christopher Young/ WHC: P. Totcharova and M. Maraña)

followed by Questions & Answers / Discussion

12.30/14.00 Lunch at Palazzo Coppini, Visit to the Palace and Presentation of Life Beyond Tourism®

14.00/15.15 Technical training on the online questionnaire – Section I

N.B.: Please bring your own laptops!

15.15/15.30 Coffee-break

15.30/17.30 Technical training on the online questionnaire – Section II

N.B.: Please bring your own laptops!

FAQ's on World Heritage processes as follow-up to Periodic Reporting

N.B.: Please prepare your questions and if possible submit them in advance to wh-reporting@unesco.org

17.30 Visit of the works of restoration of Cappella Rucellai

Wednesday, 18 September 2013

08.30/10.30 Showcasing national World Heritage initiatives (*5 min presentations by participants*)

Participants are invited to choose a topic; some suggestions are: risk management (i.e. fires, floods, earthquakes), community involvement, sustainable tourism, legislation

10.30/10.45 Coffee-break

10.45/12.30 Special Focus – Statements of Outstanding Universal Value

a) Process, timeline, case studies (WHC: A. Fiebig)

b) Statements of Outstanding Universal Value as a basis for management systems and decision-making processes (WHC: K. Manz; and Advisory Bodies)

followed by Questions & Answers

12.30/14.00 Lunch

14.00/16.00 Capacity Building: Global and sub-regional strategies (ICCROM and WHC) resulting from the Periodic Reporting exercise

followed by Discussion

Presentation of the “Management Cultural Heritage” Manual - ICCROM

16.00/16.15 Coffee-break

16.15/18.00 Closing discussion and remarks

19.00/21.00 Cocktail Dinner at Palazzo Medici Riccardi with a visit of the Cappella Benozzo Gozzoli

Thursday, 19 September 2013

09.30/12.30 Site Visit - Percorso del Principe

12.30/14.00 Light Lunch at Villa Bardini

Afternoon: Departure of participants

Participant List

	SURNAME	NAME	COMPANY OR INSTITUTION	STATE PARTY
1.	Benissi	Constantina	Hellenic Ministry of Culture & Sports	Greece
2.	Borchi	Alessandra	UNESCO Kabul Office	
3.	Cesi	Adele	Ufficio Patrimonio Mondiale UNESCO	Italy
4.	De Marco	Luisa	ICOMOS	
5.	De Miguel	Laura	Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport	Spain
6.	de Pinho Lopes	Luiz	Direção-Geral do Património Cultural	Portugal
7.	Dimitropoulou	Vassiliki	Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports	Greece
8.	Duzcu	Seda	Ministry of Culture and Tourism	Turkey
9.	Ferraro	Valentina	World Heritage Centre, UNESCO	
10.	Fiebig	Alexandra	World Heritage Centre, UNESCO	
11.	Francini	Carlo	Ufficio UNESCO - referente Centro Storico di Firenze - Patrimonio Mondiale UNESCO	Italy
12.	Etowar	Valentino	World Heritage Centre, UNESCO	
13.	Galland	Pierre	IUCN	
14.	Young	Christopher	Focal Point	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
15.	Kav Venaki	Guy	Israel WHCom	Israel
16.	Lagi	Adele	Ufficio Patrimonio Mondiale UNESCO	Italy
17.	Lisitzin	Katri	ICCROM	
18.	Maggiore	Anna Maria	Ministry for Environment and Protection of Land and Sea	Italy
19.	Mampaso	Cristina	Ufficio Patrimonio Mondiale UNESCO	Italy
20.	Manz	Kerstin	World Heritage Centre, UNESCO	
21.	Marana	Maidier	World Heritage Centre, UNESCO	

22.	Riccio	Francesca	Ufficio Patrimonio Mondiale UNESCO	Italy
23.	Sayar	Bengü	Ministry of Culture and Tourism	Turkey
24.	Serlupi Crescenzi	Maria	Vatican Museums	Vatican City State (Holy See)
25.	Søe Eriksen	Ole	Nordic World Heritage Foundation	
26.	Thompson	Jane	ICCROM	
27.	Totcharova	Petya	World Heritage Centre, UNESCO	
28.	Uncini	Alessandra	Vatican Museums	Vatican City State (Holy See)
29.	Volpinari	Marina	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	San Marino
30.	Zammit	Maria Elena	National Museum of Archaeology	Malta