

World Heritage 2002

Shared Legacy, Common Responsibility



WORLD HERITAGE 2002 **Shared Legacy, Common Responsibility**

Associated Workshops
Italy
11-12 November 2002

MONITORING WORLD HERITAGE

VICENZA

CONCLUSIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP

Hosted by the City of Vicenza and Intesa Bci
Organized by ICCROM and UNESCO's World Heritage Centre
With the support of ICOMOS and IUCN

World Heritage 2002

Shared Legacy, Common Responsibility

The Monitoring World Heritage meeting, held in the Palazzo Leoni Montanari in Vicenza, Nov. 11 and 12, 2002 was organised by ICCROM and UNESCO's World Heritage Centre, and generously supported by the Banca Intesa BCI, and the City of Vicenza. Organisation of the meeting was also supported by ICOMOS and IUCN who both nominated key experts and provided financial support for participation. The Monitoring meeting was attended by 23 experts from 16 countries.

The principal purpose of the meeting was to strengthen appreciation and appropriate use of monitoring in the effective management of heritage properties of cultural and natural value, particularly in the context of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List.

In this context, the World Heritage system should be understood as offering a vehicle to promote best practices in monitoring for all heritage sites.

The sub-objectives of the meeting foreseen in the planning stage were:

1. To place the workshop discussion in the context of the large stream of related global meetings and initiatives concerned with monitoring issues for cultural and natural heritage.
2. To present current World Heritage Committee Advisory Body initiatives for monitoring.
3. To strengthen co-operation in tangible ways among those responsible for monitoring cultural and natural heritage.
4. To explore the effective integration of the new monitoring technologies within site management systems and programmes.

The workshop consisted of working sessions during which all participants presented summaries of the papers submitted in advance, followed by discussion and synthesis of issues and points raised. The papers were grouped around the following themes: Advisory Body and Committee views, WH monitoring and Periodic Reporting experiences, Monitoring Frameworks/ Design of Monitoring Systems, Practical Experiences in Monitoring, Monitoring Technologies and Tools, Monitoring Issues and Principles. The two final sessions focused on conclusions, identification of key outcomes and suggestions for follow-up. Participants also reviewed a summary document of issues raised during discussion of papers, which will be included in the proceedings of the workshop to be published.

Participants agreed upon the following conclusions:

- Monitoring is an essential part of the World Heritage site management, and should be understood not as external imposed control, but as providing information to aid management processes, and conservation planning.
- Monitoring should be seen as the essential underpinning of effective Periodic Reporting at site level.
- The commitment necessary to establish a permanent monitoring system is more than balanced by the long term benefits offered by the system.
- Common basic principles underlie monitoring practices in both cultural and natural fields.

World Heritage 2002

Shared Legacy, Common Responsibility

- Monitoring should guide managers toward giving emphasis to maintenance and preventive measures thus relieving the need for curative/ restorative interventions.
- The choice of monitoring systems and methodologies must be linked to the specific cultural and institutional context of the site.
- Effective monitoring requires strengthening links between efforts undertaken for the definition of heritage values, the setting of management objectives and their use in monitoring systems.

In order to carry the ideas expressed above toward implementation, participants proposed the following practical steps:

Policy concerns:

- Integrating many of the technical recommendations coming from the meeting within the ongoing process of revision of the Operational Guidelines.
- Exploring alternative means of communicating site level Periodic Reports to increase understanding and utility of information presented (for example, in a matrix format) .
- A working group was established to review definitions and terminology in order to quickly develop a consensus which could be presented and reviewed in forthcoming natural and cultural heritage forums, including the March 2003 review of the Operational Guidelines.

Operational concerns:

- A proposal was made to establish a thematic, on-line network for World Heritage monitoring in order to exchange experiences, and to create an accessible knowledge management system driven by the interests of stakeholders. One of the meeting participants has offered to support the initial stage of network development.
- Training courses and activities concerning monitoring (with field components) should be designed and implemented involving regional scientific partners and potential donors.
- The Secretariat of the Convention, in the context of the design of regional programmes, should focus on monitoring selected sites for an adequate period of time and with adequate resources in order to acquire the necessary data for an informed decision-making process by the Committee.
- The Secretariat might also consider reviewing past reactive monitoring mission reports in order to evaluate effectiveness of work carried out.
- Manuals being developed should provide in a user friendly way examples of best practices to guide site managers through the documenting and monitoring processes.

World Heritage 2002

Shared Legacy, Common Responsibility

- The feasibility of extending the “Enhancing Our Heritage” project (currently being implemented by IUCN and UNESCO) to cultural heritage monitoring should be explored.
