

---

# SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING IN EUROPE

## Sub-Regional Reflection Sessions

### Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe

2 December 2014 – Fortress of Suomenlinna

This document provides background information for the Sub-Regional Consultation Sessions, for which the following objectives have been set:

**Session 1:**

- Review the First Cycle PR Sub-Regional Recommended Actions.
- Discuss the Second Cycle PR Priority Actions for the sub-region.

**Session 2:**

- Presentation of the Outcomes of the Desk Studies for Capacity-Building per sub-region (by the authors of the studies).
- Discuss priority capacity-building activities for the sub-region in the overall framework of the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy (2011).

**Please note that the conclusions of sub-regional Background Desk Studies for Capacity Building were devised by consultants, and do not necessarily reflect the views of UNESCO or the World Heritage Centre.**

## FIRST CYCLE: RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE BASIS OF THE 4 C (2006)

Central and South-Eastern Europe							
Objectives	Responsibility					Comments	
	WH Committee	WHC	Advisory Bodies	States Parties	Site Manag <sup>t</sup>		
<b>Strategic Objective: Strengthen the Credibility of the World Heritage List</b>							
Reach a broader recognition of the importance of World Heritage as a model for sustainable use and tourism for the benefit of local/national communities	X	X	X	X	X		
Ensure better coordination and co-operation between cultural and natural heritage in all relevant levels (from local to international)	X	X	X	X	X		
<b>Strategic Objective: Ensure the Effective Conservation of World Heritage Properties</b>							
Develop preventive and proactive approaches to conservation: - by involving all stakeholders and integrating them into management issues - by integrating World Heritage management into national, regional and local planning mechanisms - by integrating conservation and development initiatives - by integrating (protective) measures for cultural and natural values			X	X	X		
Ensure that national institutions responsible for (natural and cultural) heritage protection and Ministries of Foreign Affairs of the State Parties further review their whole legal base in order to define the strengths and weaknesses of international cooperation in the field of heritage conservation and develop general policies for future actions in this realm				X			
Ensure effective management by establishing adequate monitoring systems relying on the identification and use of site-specific indicators, including those related to tourism				X	X		
Ensure adequate staffing (both in number and qualification), material/technical equipments with (sustainable) financial sources according to specific needs of World Heritage properties				X	X		

Central and South-Eastern Europe							
Objectives	Responsibility					Comments	
	WH Committee	WHC	Advisory Bodies	States Parties	Site Manag <sup>t</sup>		
<b>Strategic Objective: Promote the Development of Effective Capacity Building in the States Parties</b>							
Establish an effective network of national focal points and site managers both in the sub-region and in a wider perspective, and enhance exchange between participants of those networks		X		X	X		
Develop targeted training facilities for site managers by: - preparing focused tool kits on management - running specialised courses for site managers and other stakeholders - organizing thematic workshops and short (1-2 days) and information 'conferences' - establishing expert-exchange programmes		X	X	X	X		
Produce and disseminate 'best practices' in all relevant fields, including: - sustainable use of World Heritage sites - management issues (serial properties, tourism etc) - environmental impact assessments - training facilities and solutions		X	X				
Encourage World Heritage focused research in several fields, including: - integrated management - monitoring (with indicators) - integrated development and conservation strategies (including impacts of large scale infrastructure projects)		X	X	X			
<b>Strategic Objective: Increase Public Awareness, Involvement and Support for World Heritage through Communication</b>							
Update the World Heritage Glossary and develop a link with the HEREIN Thesaurus (as many languages as possible), for a better common understanding		X	X				
Develop models and standards for information and interpretation		X					
Publish and disseminate: - basic World Heritage documents and all relevant information as widely as possible - the results of Periodic Reporting exercise, in local languages as much as possible		X		X			

Central and South-Eastern Europe							
	Objectives	Responsibility					Comments
		WH Committee	WHC	Advisory Bodies	States Parties	Site Manag <sup>t</sup>	
	Enhance and support participation in heritage preservation and management targeting: - the youth generation including young professionals - local communities and NGOs - media - education (universities etc.)		X		X	X	

Comments section: Please rate each item of the First Cycle Action Plan as follows:

- **A:** Achieved
- **N:** Not Achieved
- **O:** Ongoing Process
- **R:** Relevant
- **NR:** Not Relevant

Eastern Europe						
Objectives	Responsibility					Comments
	WH Committee	WHC	Advisory Bodies	States Parties	Site Manag <sup>†</sup>	
<b>Strategic Objective: Strengthen the Credibility of the World Heritage List</b>						
Update national inventories using appropriate information management technologies (e.g. digitisation and databases)		X	X	X	X	
Update documentation on existing World Heritage properties		X		X	X	
Update Tentative Lists and develop policies concerning procedures for such revision		X		X		
Harmonise Tentative Lists within the sub-region and with other sub-regions in Europe and globally		X	X	X		
Establish strategies for future nominations in each country and enhance inter-institutional cooperation for the preparation of nomination dossiers				X		
<b>Strategic Objective: Ensure the Effective Conservation of World Heritage Properties</b>						
Define integrated policies for the conservation of both cultural and natural World Heritage				X		
Reform existing heritage legislations				X		
Design a sub-regional programme aiming to help States Parties establish the effective management mechanisms for the cultural and natural properties		X	X	X		
Establish appropriate management plans for all inscribed properties				X		
Enhance cooperation between States Parties in the fields of heritage protection and conservation located on their territories, in particular in the case of shared heritage				X		
Develop scientific studies and research programmes specific to World Heritage		X		X	X	
<b>Strategic Objective: Promote the Development of Effective Capacity Building in the States Parties</b>						
Explore national and international funding for World Heritage activities in general and improve the level of service for heritage conservation in particular		X	X	X		
Develop sub-regional programmes focused on capacity-building for institutions and site managers involved in heritage management and conservation activities	X	X	X	X	X	

Eastern Europe						
Objectives	Responsibility					Comments
	WH Committee	WHC	Advisory Bodies	States Parties	Site Manag <sup>r</sup>	
Institutionalise and reinforce the network of focal points		X		X		
Develop sub-regional programmes to create training opportunities for policy and decision makers, site managers, conservation specialists and NGOs		X	X	X		
Develop an ICCROM global training strategy for World Heritage in the sub-region			X			
Provide specific training to help States Parties to define boundaries and buffer and core zones for World Heritage sites		X	X	X		
Develop a European and worldwide programme to foster cooperation and exchange ideas, technical experience and contacts between specialists of different countries involved in World Heritage activities		X	X	X		
One of the main achievements of the Periodic Reporting lies in the creation of a community of focal points. Keep this network operational in the future, expand its responsibilities and provide it with all possible assistance		X	X	X	X	
<b>Strategic Objective: Increase Public Awareness, Involvement and Support for World Heritage through Communication</b>						
Organize workshops and other programmes to increase community participation in heritage conservation and management		X	X	X		
Join the <i>Young People's Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion Project</i>				X		
Design a sub-regional project to support the involvement of NGOs and the private sector in the implementation of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i>		X	X	X		
Develop a sub-regional programme to coordinate awareness-raising activities		X	X	X		

Comments section: Please rate each item of the First Cycle Action Plan as follows:

- **A:** Achieved
- **N:** Not Achieved
- **O:** Ongoing Process
- **R:** Relevant
- **NR:** Not Relevant

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CAPACITY-BUILDING STRATEGY FOR THE CENTRAL, EASTERN AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE SUB-REGION

From the “Report on the State of Conservation of the World Heritage Properties and Sub-Regional Capacity-Building Needs in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe”. Author: Katarzyna Piotrowska. See also **Annex I** for the complete Study.

State-Parties to the World Heritage Convention are responsible for ensuring the protection, conservation and presentation of cultural and natural heritage having Outstanding Universal Value (art. 4 of the Convention). According to the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, par. 96, 97 and 111 Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties, including the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity at the time of inscription, have to be sustained or enhanced over time. For that reason the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List must have clearly delineated boundaries and adequate long-term legislative, regulatory, institutional and/or traditional protection and effective management systems with common elements, which could include:

- a thorough shared understanding of the property by all stakeholders;
- a cycle of planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and feedback;
- the monitoring and assessment of the impacts of trends, changes, and of proposed interventions;
- the involvement of partners and stakeholders;
- the allocation of necessary resources;
- capacity-building; and
- an accountable, transparent description of how the management system functions.

The overarching goal is effective management of World Heritage properties, enabling protection of its Outstanding Universal Value:

- quality of World Heritage properties is safeguarded, and
- properties play a valued role in the local communities' life.

Having analysed the state of conservation reports and decisions on nominations from the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region it may be concluded that there is a fundamental problem with an organisation of World Heritage sites and legal measure to plan and control development.

Main objective for a capacity-building strategy in the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region (as in other sub-regions) is to cause that the managers and stakeholders are properly qualified to face complex realities and deal with the changing environment and circumstances at a World Heritage site. To achieve the goal the following are required:

1. Understanding of the World Heritage Convention, the World Heritage List, and the concept of a World Heritage property – defining elements: OUV and its attributes, authenticity and integrity; approach to protection, conservation and management; procedures; etc.
2. Legal bases for an effective heritage protection, conducted in a sustainable and inclusive/participatory way (legal tools and measures, clear procedures, etc.), especially for ensembles and sites/areas.
3. Political will and community engagement – awareness of the role heritage plays in development (cultural, social, scientific, economic).
4. Appropriate conservation, planning, management, social skills (soft skills), etc.; different sets of skills depending on scope of duties and a place/role in a management system.
5. Demand for a quality interventions/designs in a heritage area/structure.

### **Suggested directions and main areas of activity for capacity-building strategy in the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region**

Identify needs for capacity building fall into two main groups. The first one refers to the management of particular property and can be handled within ongoing management activities. Resolution of the issues from the second group can be only achieved by bringing external stakeholders and decisions at local or national level that create a favourable environment for quality management of World Heritage properties.

Further four main target groups are possible to identify:

#### 1. Managers of World Heritage sites (partners in management of World Heritage properties)

- knowledge (theory) – awareness raising activities
- World Heritage Convention
- principles of organisation and management of World Heritage sites
- quality of protection and conservation – conservation doctrine and practice
- environmental/heritage impact assessments

abilities (practice) – capacity building activities

- strategic thinking and planning skills
- negotiation skills and ability to act in a conflict situation
- ability to cooperate in an effective way
- cooperation and communication skills for cross-sectors and multi professional cooperation
- managing a protected area – planning, implementation, monitoring and review

#### 2. Local authorities / local government officers

knowledge (theory) – awareness raising activities

- World Heritage Convention
- role of heritage for development and for local community
- integrated approach to planning, including protection of heritage in local development plans
- landscape approach to protection and conservation of sites
- environmental/heritage impact assessments

#### 3. Professionals – conservators / planners / architects etc.

knowledge (theory) – awareness raising activities

- World Heritage Convention
- principles for organisation and management of World Heritage sites
- quality of protection and conservation – conservation doctrine and practice
- environmental/heritage impact assessments



abilities (practice) – capacity building activities

- conservation of different fabrics
- landscape approach to protection and conservation of sites
- spatial planning and integrated approach to management of space/land
- environmental/heritage impact assessments
- designing for protected areas (new interventions or adjustments for new or extended functions, etc.)

#### 4. Central institutions / heritage officers

knowledge (theory) – awareness raising activities

- World Heritage Convention
- law of heritage protection
- principles for organisation and management of World Heritage sites
- quality of protection and conservation – conservation doctrine and practice
- conservation of different fabrics
- environmental/heritage impact assessments

abilities (practice) – capacity building activities

- World Heritage Convention
- legal heritage protection
- landscape approach to protection and conservation of sites
- cross-sectors and multi professional cooperation and communication
- negotiation skills and ability to act in a conflict situation

Programmes for capacity building need to be developed within the agreed *World Heritage Strategy for Capacity-Building*. The attached table has a selection of goals and actions which are most relevant for the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region.

**Suggested high-level goals/ actions for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region Capacity Building Strategy**

(taken from Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage)

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
<b>Credibility</b>				
1. The Convention is understood and achieves overall positive benefit to conservation while avoiding negative impacts	1.1 Creation of specific training and communication tools and opportunities to explain the key concepts and processes of the World Heritage Convention effectively and consistently, to ensure that all States Parties and all actors in the Convention, including local communities, appreciate and are able to make the most effective and sustainable use of the Convention to support cultural and natural heritage conservation.	PIC	ABs, WHC, C2Cs, States Parties	It should reach as broad audience as possible.
	1.2 A set of indicators are developed based on State of Conservation reporting process and other monitoring and management effectiveness processes to identify positive and negative trends for conservation of cultural and natural heritage.	PIC	ABs, WHC, C2Cs	It is a very useful approach in order to identify needs which should be promoted at the regional and individual State Parties levels.  State Parties should be also considered as potential implementation partners.

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
	1.3 Issues related to the World Heritage Convention are included within degree programmes and long vocational courses to ensure that professionals being trained have a better basic awareness of the World Heritage Convention and its strengths and weaknesses.	P	ICCROM, University Programmes, C2Cs, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, FUUH	<p>State Parties may be also potential implementation partners.</p> <p>Institutions should be also considered as potential audience, as they organise/may organise courses.</p> <p>There is a question of how to achieve a quality of these courses if organised within capacity of State Parties or through the university programmes (relevant, updated information on the World Heritage Convention).</p>
2. A more balanced World Heritage List is achieved, and fewer nominations suffer serious problems following their submission				
	2.3 Increased and more effective support is provided to States Parties on tentative list creation with a priority given to strengthen capacity in countries with limited representation on the World Heritage List.	I	ABs, C2Cs	
	2.4 Prioritized thematic studies and other tools are created that assist in the identification of appropriate, prioritized tentative lists, and the harmonization of lists within regions and/or themes as appropriate.	I	ABs	?

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
	2.7 Specific guidance and related training and tools are created in order to support more effective community participation processes within the preparation of nominations.	PIC	ABs, C2Cs, regional training partners, States Parties	This is relevant also for managing a property after inscription, as in many cases nominations were developed without proper engagement of local communities.
	2.8 The network of specialists able to advise States Parties within Advisory Bodies and their networks is expanded.	PI	ABs	This is relevant also for conservation and management needs (advisory missions).
<b>Conservation</b>				
3. National Institutions are effective in the identification, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage	3.1 A series of guidance documents are developed to assist States to assess their capacity and identify and advocate for strengthened capacity at national level. Topics should include: a) legal frameworks and their application; b) improvement of advocacy in national decision-making processes (including the capacity of non-heritage ministries to participate in the goals of the World Heritage Convention), c) the ability of heritage institutions to obtain accorded appropriate resources to function effectively.	I	ABs, C2Cs, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs	Practitioners should also be considered as potential audience, as they may influence organisation of or organise programmes and courses.  State Parties may be potential implementation partners.
	3.2 National strategies for institutional and professional capacity strengthening are developed and put in place, in response to needs identified in the first and second cycles of periodic reporting. (See Point 12 below)	I	States Parties	State Parties may need help or cooperation in development of strategies.

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
	3.3 Training materials and activities are developed and implemented to increase the capacity of national institutions to improve conservation and management of the heritage	I	States Parties, ABs, WHC, C2Cs	
	3.4 Focused mid career training is provided to support professional development of nature and culture professionals within national heritage institutions, including ministries, government agencies and NGOs.	PI	ICCROM, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, C2Cs, University programmes	State Parties may be potential implementation partners.
	3.6 Effective management and conservation tools are developed for use at the national level, including: a) systems for assessment of developments and projects in terms of their impacts on natural and cultural heritage (EIA for example), b) integrated national and property level planning related to disaster risk reduction for heritage	I	ABs, WHC, C2Cs, States Parties	Practitioners should also be considered as potential audience
	3.7 Focused training is provided for key stakeholders in the tourism industry and other sectors which impact on the protection of World Heritage (both public and private) on appropriate conservation and sustainable development needs in relation to their specific sectors at World Heritage Sites (and potential World Heritage Sites).	PIC	C2Cs, regional training partners, States Parties	
4. Effective				

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
sustainable management and conservation of World Heritage occurs, taking into account the dynamics of specific local contexts and settings within the larger framework of global WH processes.	4.3 Training on management of World Heritage properties is developed and implemented to strengthen planning and management skills including methodologies and tools for assessment of Management Effectiveness linked to clear indicators.	PI	ICCROM, C2Cs, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, University Programmes, States Parties	In case of cultural landscapes communities should also be considered as potential audience.
	4.5 Training on disaster risk management at World Heritage properties is developed and implemented to strengthen planning and response to both natural and man-made disasters.	PIC	ABs, WHC, C2Cs, States Parties	
	4.6 A network of up to 20 classroom sites are identified within the World Heritage List, with appropriate balance of regions and site types, to provide venues for in-field training using models of good practice in site management.	PI	ABs, WHC, States Parties	In addition, existing World Heritage properties could be involved in the preparation of new nominations.  Communities should also be considered as potential audience.
	4.7 A prioritized programme of research on management and conservation needs of World Heritage properties is carried out, based on information coming from periodic reporting, SOC reports, overall assessments of SOC trends, and results of management effectiveness assessments.	PI	UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, C2Cs, University programmes, FUUH	

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
	4.9 Mechanisms are developed to respond in a timely manner to help States Parties address issues arising from the State of Conservation process and other relevant Committee decisions.	I	WHC, ABs, C2Cs, States Parties	There is a need for parallel actions at the State Parties side - State Parties should develop mechanisms to use the international assistance (reactive monitoring process and advisory missions).
5. Skills for conservation of cultural and natural heritage are strengthened.	5.1 Availability of appropriately skilled individuals with particular conservation skills is evaluated at Regional Periodic Reporting meetings and at the national level	PI	ABs, WHC, C2Cs, States Parties	
	5.2 Training activities are designed and implemented to improve identified areas of skills shortages, or emerging needs for skills to face new challenges.	PC	ABs, C2Cs, regional training partners, university partners	Institutions should also be considered as potential audience.  State Parties may be potential implementation partners.
	5.3 Networks of expertise are strengthened to bring together conservation practitioners and community groups to both promote mutual learning, and also better identify future capacity building needs.	PC	States Parties	Institutions should also be considered as potential audience.
6. The availability of funding and other resources to meet conservation needs	6.1 A network of partners at the site level (site managers and others involved at the site) is created to work together to support priority conservation needs at properties, identified through all management effectiveness and monitoring processes.	PIC	States Parties	

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
in World Heritage Sites is significantly enhanced	6.2 Tools are developed to enable States Parties to more effectively use the International Assistance process to improve conservation and management at World Heritage properties.	I	ABs, WHC	
	6.3 Tools are developed to enhance the ability of States Parties and site managers to request and secure extra-budgetary funding from a variety of sources.	I	ABs, WHC, C2Cs, regional training partners	
<b>Community</b>				
7. Greater mutual benefits to communities and their heritage results through sustainable development associated with World Heritage Properties	7.1 Targeted research on benefits and best practices for the integration of World Heritage conservation and sustainable development goals for communities is undertaken to provide examples and case studies of successful practice for use throughout the World Heritage system.	IC	University programmes, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, C2Cs, FUUH	Practitioners should also be considered as potential audience.  State Parties may be potential implementation partners.
	7.2 Training and capacity building activities are designed and implemented for national and local institutions, World Heritage site managers, and other stakeholders to integrate heritage conservation and development goals in related sectors (nature, culture, tourism, and development).	PIC	C2Cs, States Parties, regional training partners	



Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
	7.3 Research and best practices in sustainable tourism, including those which are based on participatory processes, are undertaken to encourage the tourism sector to contribute in a positive way to the protection of World Heritage properties and the development of communities.	PIC	University programmes, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, C2Cs, FUUH	
	7.4 Networks of World Heritage properties are created at the national level, and where appropriate among neighboring countries, in order to enhance the capacity of these properties to contribute to development activities at national and regional scales	IC	States Parties	
8. Greater and inclusive participation of local communities in heritage conservation, presentation and associated development.	8.1 Research on effective approaches for community engagement and participation including lessons learned within World Heritage properties is undertaken as a basis for identifying successful examples to be used for capacity building and learning between properties.	PIC	University programmes, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, C2Cs, FUUH	
	8.2 A series of tools for outreach and capacity building are designed and diffused to build the capacity of communities to understand and participate in the World Heritage Convention.	C	ABs, WHC, University programmes, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, C2Cs, FUUH	Practitioners and institutions should also be considered as potential audience.  State Parties may be potential implementation partners.

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
	8.3 Local communities, and other stakeholders, working with site managers, are encouraged to actively participate in the protection and presentation of World Heritage properties.	IC	States Parties	Practitioners should also be considered as potential audience.
	8.4 Basic information on the World Heritage Convention is made available on-line and in printed form in as many languages as possible.	C	WHC	State Parties should be encouraged to make information on World Heritage Convention and the List available on-line.  Practitioners and institutions should also be considered as potential audience.
<b>Communication</b>				
9. Increased awareness of the need for and benefits from heritage conservation and the contribution	9.1 Tools will be designed and made available to strengthen the capacity of States Parties and World Heritage site managers to present World Heritage on site and at a more general level, supported by effective and appropriate guidance on the use of the World Heritage Emblem and brand.	PI	WHC, ABs, States Parties, C2Cs, UNESCO Chairs, University programmes	

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
of the World Heritage Convention to achieving this.	9.2 The inclusion of the World Heritage Convention as a component of school curricula continues to be promoted, and facilitated by an active programme of communication and preparation and dissemination of resources on World Heritage for schools via the programmes of UNESCO and via curricula development on national levels.	C	WHC, States Parties, University Programmes (focusing on primary and secondary education)	Practitioners and institutions should also be considered as potential audience.

Capacity Building: Enhancing the System		Lead Responsibility	
10. Beyond the contribution of capacity building to achieving positive results for the other 4 “Cs” of the strategic directions of the World Heritage Convention, new approaches are needed to ensure that the World Heritage Capacity	10.3 Effective communication between providers of capacity building and with the audiences / beneficiaries is put in place to ensure coordination and encourage actors to contribute as part of the broader activities of the strategy.	ICCROM	State Parties may be potential partners.
	10.5 A programme of translation and dissemination of a range of documents is instituted to ensure that information is reaching a wide range of stakeholders.	ICCROM, IUCN, and ICOMOS	State Parties may be potential partners.
	10.6 New learning environments and means of provision and dissemination of information are researched and pilot projects implemented (on-line tools, short videos, etc.)	ICCROM, IUCN, and ICOMOS	State Parties may be potential partners.

<b>Capacity Building: Enhancing the System</b>		<b>Lead Responsibility</b>	
Building itself, is effective and is able to report results to the World Heritage Committee and other stakeholders.	10.7 Regional strategies and programmes for each region are put in place (including sub-regional, and national approaches where appropriate) to strategically plan and implement capacity building. These plans are based on the results of periodic reporting exercises, and other regional needs assessments and programmes concerning cultural and natural heritage as appropriate, integrating the efforts of ICCROM, IUCN, ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre, Regionally focused category 2 centres and relevant regional bodies. The proposed timeline and strategy development process for these regional strategies are shown below.	ICCROM with C2Cs, and regional training partners	
	10.8 Fundraising is planned and carried out to ensure that there are resources to enable the implementation of the capacity building strategy. Sources of funds could include increased contributions to capacity building from the World Heritage Fund, and extra-budgetary funding by States Parties to the Convention, and new external partners.	World Heritage Committee and States Parties	

# ANNEX I

## **Report on the State of Conservation of the World Heritage Properties and Sub-Regional Capacity-Building Needs in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe**

Katarzyna Piotrowska

Warsaw, May-June 2014  
(rev. November 2014)

## **1. Introduction**

In the framework of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting on the application of the World Heritage Convention by the States Parties in the regions of Europe and North America, and in view of the development of a sub-regional capacity-building strategy for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, this report aims to support the Europe and North America Unit of the World Heritage Centre by providing an overview of the capacity-building needs identified for the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region since the last Cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise in 2006.

The report includes main priorities, actions and recommendations concerning capacity-building for World Heritage in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe. It is based on an analysis of a representative selection of state-of-conservation reports presented to the World Heritage Committee as well as Committee nomination decisions from 2006 through 2013. It also takes into consideration the key proposal of the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011 (UNESCO, Paris, 2011, Decision 35COM9.B).

The report also refers to different sources that include capacity-building needs identified through various initiatives and at different meetings during the preparation and implementation of the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting for the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region. The meetings include:

- Exchange and Information Meeting on the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise for Europe and North America, 37th session of the World Heritage Committee, Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 21 June 2013
- Capacity-Building Strategy Initiative for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe Region, 37th session of the World Heritage Committee, Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 19 June 2013
- Workshop for the World Heritage National Focal Points for Periodic Reporting from the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, Baku, Azerbaijan, 29-31 October 2013
- Workshop for the World Heritage National Focal Points for Periodic Reporting from Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, Tbilisi, Georgia, 14-16 November 2012.
- Information Meeting to Present the Capacity-Building Strategy Initiative for the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe region, 36<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation, 29 June 2012

## **2. A short characteristic of the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region**

The Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region considered in this report covers an area of approximately 19 274 000 km<sup>2</sup> and consists of 20 countries:

1. Albania
2. Armenia
3. Azerbaijan
4. Belarus
5. Bosnia Herzegovina
6. Bulgaria
7. Croatia
8. Czech Republic
9. FYR of Macedonia
10. Georgia
11. Hungary
12. Moldova
13. Montenegro

14. Poland
15. Romania
16. Russian Federation
17. Serbia
18. Slovakia
19. Slovenia
20. Ukraine

A characteristic feature of the sub-region of Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe is a 25-year period of system transformation that began with the fall of communism in 1989. This period of deep transformation included: regime change and the implementation of democratic institutions and procedures, and economic reforms aimed at creating a free market based on private property and social change in the direction of acceptance of the new regulations. In each country, these changes have taken place with different dynamics and have varying degrees of advancement. All listed countries were members of the Communist Bloc and some are former Soviet Union republics.

USRR became the State Party to the Convention in 1988. After the dissolution of the former USSR, the Russian Federation informed the UN Secretary-General that as at 24 December 1991 the Russian Federation maintained full responsibility for all the rights and obligations of the USSR under the Charter of the United Nations and multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General. Belarus and Ukraine ratified the Convention in 1988 in their quality of UNESCO member States (since 1954)<sup>1</sup>.

1. Russian Federation, 12 October 1988 (ratification)
2. Belarus, 12 October 1988 (ratification)
3. Ukraine, 12 October 1988 (ratification)
4. Armenia, 5 September 1993 (notification of succession)
5. Azerbaijan, 16 December 1993 (ratification)
6. Georgia, 4 November 1992 (notification of succession)
7. Republic of Moldova, 23 September 2002 (ratification)

Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro and Macedonia belonged to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia became the State Party to the Convention in 1975. On 11 September 2001, the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia notified its succession to UNESCO treaties which the former Yugoslavia was a party. As of 4 February 2003, the name of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was changed to Serbia and Montenegro.

1. Serbia, 11 September 2001 (notification of succession)
2. Montenegro, 3 June 2006 (notification of succession)
3. Bosnia and Herzegovina, 12 July 1993 (notification of succession)
4. Croatia, 6 July 1992 (notification of succession)
5. Former Yugoslav Rep. of Macedonia, 30 April 1997 (notification of succession)
6. Slovenia, 5 November 1992 (notification of succession)

Czech and Slovak Federal Republic became the State Party to the Convention in 1990. The Czech and Slovak Federal Republic was dissolved on 31 December 1992 and, as of 1 January 1993, was separated into two distinct States: the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic.

1. Czech Republic, 26 March 1993 (notification of succession)
2. Slovakia, 31 March 1993 (notification of succession)

Other countries of the sub-region are:

1. Albania, 10 July 1989 (ratification)
2. Bulgaria, 7 March 1974 (acceptance)
3. Hungary, 15 July 1985 (acceptance)
4. Poland, 29 June 1976 (ratification)
5. Romania, 16 May 1990 (acceptance)

An important factor with a direct impact on the approach to the cultural and natural heritage in the studied sub-region is European Union (EU) membership. Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland,

<sup>1</sup> Periodic Reporting and Action Plan, Europe 2005-2006, ed. M. Rossler, C. Menetrey-Monchau, UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2007; p. 27.

Slovakia, and Slovenia joined the EU in 2004, subsequently joined by Bulgaria and Croatia. EU regulations, such as the system of subsidies, have a direct impact on development and the dynamics of change.

There are many differences between the countries of the sub-region. At the same time, there is a considerable number of conditions common to Central, East and South European societies. An important issue is to determine which features are due to the recent communist rule and which are due to their peripheral geopolitical position in Europe. Economic backwardness and memories of subjugation, both communist and older, add up to what we may define as features specific to this sub-region of Europe<sup>2</sup>. In addition, the relatively frequent change of state borders and movement of people has resulted cumulatively in a specific attitude to build heritage and landscapes.

---

<sup>2</sup> J. Hausner, *Culture and Transformation*, (in:) Culture and Development. 20 Years after the Fall of Communism in Europe, International Cultural Centre & Council of Europe, Kraków 2010, p. 50.



### 3. Trends on state of conservation reports and nomination decisions by the World Heritage Committee

#### A. INTRODUCTION

THERE ARE 116 WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES LOCATED IN THE IN CENTRAL, EASTERN AND SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE SUB-REGION<sup>3</sup>: 96 CULTURAL, 19 NATURAL AND 1 MIXED. MOST OF THE SITES ARE CULTURAL PROPERTIES, OUT OF WHICH 1/3 ARE HISTORIC TOWNS AND TOWN CENTRES. THE STUDY COVERED 53 WORLD HERITAGE SITES LOCATED IN 17 COUNTRIES.

In the years 1979-2014 there were 366 state of conservation reports (SOC reports) concerning 51 properties of 18 countries presented and/or discussed by the World Heritage Committee. In the years 2006-2013 the World Heritage Committee received 184 state of conservation reports concerning 39 properties (11 natural, 28 cultural) from 15 State Parties.

No.	YEAR	NUMBER OF SOC REPORTS	NUMBER OF NEW PROPERTIES REPORTED (first SOC report)	NUMBER OF STATE-PARTIES
1	2006	15	15 (in 2006 or before)	9
2	2007	24	9	14
3	2008	25	5	12
4	2009	29	3	14
5	2010	21	2	10
6	2011	26	3	12
7	2012	21	0	10
8	2013	23	1	10

In addition to 39 properties, which were subject to the reactive monitoring process, 14 new inscriptions or extensions were taken into account in the study. In the last 8 years since 2006, there were 14 new sites inscribed on the List and 6 properties were extended.

No.	YEAR	NUMBER OF INSCRIPTIONS	NUMBER OF EXTENSIONS	NUMBER OF STATE-PARTIES
1	2006	1	1	2
2	2007	4 (1 trans*)	0	5
3	2008	2	1	3
4	2009	0	1	1
5	2010	1	2	3
6	2011	2	0	2
7	2012	2	0	2
8	2013	2 (1 trans)	1	2

\* Transnational or trans-boundary property located in more than 1 State-Party of the sub-region.

There are 3 sites from the sub-region being inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2013.

Number of properties, which are the subject of the reactive monitoring process, varies between 21 and 29 per year. There is no a tendency to grow.

<sup>3</sup> In the sub-region there are several properties that have been inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage before the country joined the Convention as a sovereign state.

No.	Country	Reactive monitoring 2006-2013		Inscription / extension 2006-2013		Number of properties in total
		Number of SOC reports	Number of properties	Number of properties	Number of properties with no SOC reports	
1	<b>Albania</b>	6	2	1	0	<b>2</b>
2	<b>Armenia</b>	-	-	-	-	-
3	<b>Azerbaijan</b>	6	1	1	1	<b>2</b>
4	<b>Belarus</b>	7	2 (1 trans*)	-	-	<b>2</b>
5	<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>	6	1	1	1	<b>2</b>
6	<b>Bulgaria</b>	9	2	1	0	<b>2</b>
7	<b>Croatia</b>	0	0	1	1	<b>1</b>
8	<b>Czech Republic</b>	11	2	-	-	<b>2</b>
9	<b>FYR of Macedonia</b>	-	-	-	-	-
10	<b>Georgia</b>	14	2	-	-	<b>2</b>
11	<b>Hungary</b>	10	3	-	-	<b>3</b>
12	<b>Moldova</b>	-	-	-	-	-
13	<b>Montenegro</b>	8	2	-	-	<b>2</b>
14	<b>Poland</b>	10	3 (2 trans)	3 (1 trans)	2 (1 trans)	<b>5 (-1 trans)</b>
15	<b>Romania</b>	9	3	1	0	<b>3</b>
16	<b>Russian Federation</b>	73	13	2	2	<b>15</b>
17	<b>Serbia</b>	7	1	2	1	<b>2</b>
18	<b>Slovakia</b>	1	1 (1 trans)	3 (1 trans)	2	<b>3</b>
19	<b>Slovenia</b>	0	0	2	2	<b>2</b>
20	<b>Ukraine</b>	12	3 (1 trans)	4 (2 trans)	3 (1 trans)	<b>6 (-2 trans)</b>

\* Transnational or trans-boundary property located in more than 1 State-Party of the sub-region.

There is a dominance of the state of conservation reports concerning properties in the Russian Federation – 73 reports, 13 properties reported, equally cultural and natural sites. Other countries have up to 3 properties reported over the years 2006-2013. Three countries: Armenia, Macedonia and Moldova are not covered by the study as there is no a state of conservation report or a new inscription/extension decision taken in the analysed period.

Reports on the state of conservation of a World Heritage property, the basis for the Committee's decision, summarize the information gathered by the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies within the framework of a reactive monitoring process. Every year the Committee takes approximately 23 decisions (statistically) on the conservation status of the World Heritage properties located in the sub-region. In its decisions, the Committee addresses conservation issues and threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the properties and provides recommendations to the State Parties.

Decisions and accompanying reports take into account various observations and recommendations. They are an excellent source of information regarding the training needs of individual properties and the countries concerned. Reports of the reactive monitoring missions are another important source of information. They contain relatively detailed analyses of the state of a

World Heritage property, proposals for corrective measures, and recommendations. Another source of information is the World Heritage List nomination decisions together with the Advisory Bodies evaluation. The inscription decisions take into account a field mission and its outcomes. The main reported issues are reflected in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and recommendations for the State Party (or State Parties in the case of transnational and trans-boundary inscriptions).

## **b. Outcomes of the analysis**

A full analysis of the state of conservation reports and nomination decisions is provided in the Annex. Presented below is a summary of the most frequently reported issues. The Online Information System, which is a comprehensive and integrated database on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and the factors affecting their Outstanding Universal Value, was used for this analysis (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc/>).

The following threats to the World Heritage properties located in the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region were identified and recorded more than 1 time in the years 2006 – 2013:

1. **Management systems/ management plan – 134 times**
2. **Housing – 65 times**
3. **Illegal activities – 42 times**
4. **Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation – 39 times**
5. **Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure – 31 times**
6. **Management activities – 31 times**
7. **Ground transport infrastructure – 29 times**
8. **Legal framework – 27 times**
9. Major linear utilities – 15 times
10. Surface water pollution – 15 times
11. Deliberate destruction of heritage – 14 times
12. Oil and gas – 13 times
13. Land conversion – 12 times
14. Mining – 12 times
15. Solid waste – 9 times
16. Erosion and siltation/ deposition – 8 times
17. Forestry /wood production – 7 times
18. Civil unrest – 7 times
19. Renewable energy facilities – 6 times
20. Fire (wildfires) – 6 times
21. Localised utilities – 5 times
22. Earthquake – 5 times
23. Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure – 4 times
24. Water infrastructure – 4 times
25. Invasive/alien terrestrial species – 4 times
26. Financial resources – 4 times
27. Relative humidity – 2 times
28. Human resources – 3 times
29. Interpretative and visitation facilities – 2 times
30. Marine transport infrastructure – 2 times

31. Non-renewable energy facilities – 2 times
32. Water (extraction) – 2 times
33. Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community – 2 times

The most frequent factor affecting World Heritage properties is attributed to an ineffective management. It appears 134 times in the World Heritage Committee decisions and related state of conservation reports. The management issues are also noted during inscription or extension processes<sup>4</sup>.

The most frequent factor affecting World Heritage properties is attributed to an ineffective management. It appears 134 times in the World Heritage Committee decisions and related state of conservation reports. The management issues are also noted during inscription or extension processes<sup>5</sup>.

After grouping the threats into categories, **management and institutional factors** are the most frequently noted issues (199 times). Other outstanding categories of threats are **building and development** (99 times) and **other human activities** (63 times). **Social/cultural use of heritage** appears often (42 times), as well as **transport and infrastructure** (36 times). To the last, services infrastructures (32 times), especially linear utilities (15 times) may be added as investments of a similar, linear character.

#### **1. Building and development – 99 times**

Commercial development - 1

Housing - 65

Interpretative and visitation facilities - 2

Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure - 31

#### **2. Transport and infrastructure – 36 times**

Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure - 4

Ground transport infrastructure - 29

Marine transport infrastructure - 2

Underground transport infrastructure - 1

#### **3. Services infrastructures – 32 times**

Localised utilities - 5

Major linear utilities - 15

Non-renewable energy facilities - 2

Renewable energy facilities - 6

Water infrastructure - 4

#### **4. Pollution – 26 times**

Ground water pollution - 1

Pollution of marine waters - 1

Solid waste - 9

Surface water pollution - 15

#### **5. Biological resource use/modification – 20 times**

---

<sup>4</sup> In some instances serious issues identified at the time of nomination start a reactive monitoring process.

<sup>5</sup> In some instances serious issues identified at the time of nomination start a reactive monitoring process.

Forestry /wood production - 7  
Land conversion - 12  
Subsistence hunting - 1

**6. Physical resource extraction – 28 times**

Mining - 12  
Oil and gas - 13  
Quarrying - 1  
Water (extraction) - 2

**7. Land conditions affecting physical fabric – 4 times**

Relative humidity - 2  
Water (rain/water table) - 1  
Wind - 1

**8. Social/cultural use of heritage – 41 times**

Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community - 2  
Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation - 39

**9. Other human activities – 63 times**

Civil unrest - 7  
Deliberate destruction of heritage - 14  
Illegal activities - 42

**10. Climate change and severe weather events – 0 times**

---

**11. Sudden ecological and geological events – 19 times**

Earthquake - 5  
Erosion and siltation/ deposition - 8  
Fire (wildfires) - 6

**12. Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species – 4 times**

Invasive/alien terrestrial species - 4

**13. Management and institutional factors – 199 times**

Financial resources - 4  
Human resources - 3  
Legal framework - 27  
Management activities - 31  
Management systems/ management plan - 134

In the years 2006-2013 the World Heritage Committee received 184 state of conservation reports concerning 39 properties from 15 State Parties. Considering individual World Heritage properties and State-Parties involved main threats noted in the reports are unfolding in the way which the following table is demonstrating. It clearly shows that management and development factors, including tourism are affecting majority of the reported properties and almost all the State-Parties.

No.	THREATS	RUSSIAN FEDERATION		OTHER STATE-PARTIES		
		NUMBER OF SOC REPORTS	NUMBER OF PROPERTIES	NUMBER OF SOC REPORTS	NUMBER OF PROPERTIES	NUMBER OF STATE-PARTIES
1	Management systems/ management plan	55	12	79	21	13
2	Housing	26	6	39	11	8
3	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	16	5	23	7	6
4	Illegal activities	20	5	22	8	8
5	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure	13	3	18	7	7
6	Management activities	13	5	18	5	4
7	Legal framework	14	4	13	6	5
8	Deliberate destruction of heritage	2	1	12	4	4
9	Ground transport infrastructure	20	3	9	5	6
10	Major linear utilities	15	3	15	3	0

### **1. Building and development – 99 times**

#### Housing – 65 times

Housing is a threat that stays on a relatively constant level (with the exception of 2006 and 2009). The issue concerns a total of 17 World Heritage properties (65 reports), and refers to countries such as Albania, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Montenegro, Romania, Russian Federation and Ukraine. Excluding the Russian Federation from the statistic, there are 11 properties affected by housing (39 reports).

#### Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure – 31 times

In some cases development pressure stem from intense development of tourism. These relate to the same range of cultural, as natural properties. In the analyzed period development of tourist resorts were noted as a negative factor in the case of 10 World Heritage properties (31 reports), and referred to countries such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Hungary, Montenegro, Poland, Russian Federation, Slovakia and Ukraine.

### **8. Social/cultural use of heritage – 41 times**

#### Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation – 39 times

Changes caused by the development of tourism and recreation have been reported for 12 of the World Heritage properties (39 reports), which are located in the following countries: Albania, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Montenegro, Romania, Russian Federation. In recent years, the problem persists at a constant level of 3-4 properties reported every year.

### **13. Management and institutional factors – 199 times:**

#### Management system / management plan – 134 times

Inadequate management system or lack of an adequate management plan<sup>6</sup> is the most frequently reported issue, considered as a threat to the World Heritage properties' Outstanding Universal Value.

The management factors were noted in case of 33 World Heritage properties (134 SOC reports), located in 14 State-Parties. These countries are: Albania, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Georgia, Hungary, Poland, Montenegro, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia and Ukraine. Excluding Russian Federation, the issue concerns 21 World Heritage properties (79 SOC reports).

Factors related to lack of or miss-functioning of management system remain on relatively high level since 2007 – they are noted as threats in case of 16-19 properties each year. The other aspect is a difficulty in solving the problem which is visible in case of some World Heritage properties in subsequent reports.

The study clearly shows that ineffective heritage management is the most common issue which should be solved by the majority of the State-Parties in the sub-region.

#### Legal framework – 27 times

The category "management and institutional factors" includes legal aspects of the protection of the World Heritage sites. The issue stays at a level of 4 properties reported every year till 2013, when a sudden rise to 7 cases can be observed. In total, legal framework as a factor affecting state of conservation concerns 10 properties in 6 countries: Bulgaria, Hungary, Montenegro, Russian Federation, Serbia and Ukraine.

The legal issues also involves illegal activities (category "other human activities") that indicate a poor implementation of the law. This problem has been noted in case of 13 World Heritage properties and concerns 9 countries: Albania, Azerbaijan, Belarus (?), Bulgaria, Montenegro, Poland, Russian Federation, Slovakia and Ukraine. It applies mostly to natural properties (illegal logging and poaching).

#### Management activities – 31 times

Management activities is a factor whose steady growth can be observed in the last 7 years. Starting from 1 property threatened by inappropriate management decisions in 2006, there is an increase to 6 in 2013. Overall, it has been noted in the case of 10 World Heritage properties (31 reports) as a threat, and refers to countries such as: Belarus, Poland, Russian Federation, Georgia and Albania.

The majority of issues/threats is being reported through next 3-4 reports, submitted for the consideration of the World Heritage Committee every year or every two years<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Management plan can be considered as a tool in a management system. See: *Managing Cultural World Heritage*, World Heritage Resource Manual, UNESCO / ICCROM / ICOMOS / IUCN, 2013.

<sup>7</sup> Since the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007), the draft decisions prepared by the World Heritage Centre, jointly with the Advisory Bodies, reflect an attempt, wherever possible, to establish a two-year reporting cycle. This approach was strongly recommended by the *Experts meeting on the decision - making procedures of the statutory organs of the World Heritage Convention* (Manama,

### c. Comments to the outcomes of the analysis

The groups of issues identified by the reactive monitoring process are closely related, and often one arises from another. The following are the most common factors affecting World Heritage properties in the sub-region.

#### Management

Management and the organization of World Heritage properties are the fundamental problematic issues in the sub-region. These issues have been noted in the great majority of World Heritage site cases that have come within the scope of interest of the World Heritage Committee (inscription, extension, reactive monitoring) in the years 2006-2013. Although in many cases the conditions have either bettered or a high activity towards problem solving has been recorded, the quality of actions typically requires improvement. In its decisions, the Committee recommends the State Parties to improve the management system by developing a management framework, setting up the management authority(ies) with a relevant mandate and clear governance arrangements or improving the management structure and strengthening the coordination.

In most cases the Committee recommends an **integrated** (overall, comprehensive, common, integrated or multidisciplinary, conservation or ecological) **management plan** to be developed and implemented. This document should be based on comprehensive inventories and research, and a thorough and multi-faceted analysis of the functioning of the site, all performed with a respect to the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value. The reports and decisions of the Committee draw particular attention to the plans' operability by establishing an appropriate organization scheme and providing adequate human and financial resources for its implementation. The plans should be integrated with the entire system of planning on the one hand, and cover the entire spectrum of issues such as the protection, conservation, presentation, tourism, traffic, risk and safety.

**Participatory approach** to management of World Heritage sites and to preparation and implementation of management plans is also one of the major challenges. Lack of involvement of all governing bodies and an unclear division of duties is often reported. There is an evident need to strengthen **cooperation** among management partners (in case of multi owned sites), state and local administration and all other stakeholders with steering committees or other coordination mechanisms for developing a common vision and strategy, and shared decision-making. Better coordination and cooperation at state and site levels, horizontally and vertically, is often recommended. Additional efforts demand international cooperation in cases of serial transnational or trans-boundary sites.

An important element of management is the inclusion of local communities in the protection of heritage, despite the fact that the issue of **local community participation** is hardly present in the state of conservation reports for the sub-region<sup>8</sup>. Only a few cases have recommendations to

---

Bahrain, 15-17 December 2010) and was subsequently formally adopted by the Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011). See Decision 35 COM 12B para.10.

<sup>8</sup> Lack of recommendations concerning local community participation in management and protection of World Heritage sites doesn't mean that the issue is not relevant. It should be rather interpreted that there are other, more urgent



cooperate with civil society (in particular with the indigenous communities) or to optimise the assets of the property for the benefit of local communities been given.

**Monitoring** is still a missing element in the management systems, both at site and State Party levels. Firstly, one should improve the management of a single site and provide important scientific information (i.e. monitoring endangered species), and secondly improve the national heritage protection system. The monitoring process (and control) in accordance with the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee should be linked with clearly defined attributes of OUV and focus on the defined monitoring indicators.

## **Conservation**

One of the issues noted in the reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and also during inscription or extension processes is lack of **restoration and conservation work** or the quality of these works. The highest international conservation standards should be ensured for every World Heritage property. It must be understood that the work should not only be of high quality and well executed. Too extensive or over invested works can result in “overconservation” or “overinterpretation”, both leading to an inaccurate picture of the past. In its recommendations the Committee encourages State Parties to use local and traditional technologies and materials, to continue still living traditions and traditional building practices. The Committee also requests development of plans, clear guidance and technical manuals for conservation, restoration and maintenance works. Giving priority to conservation and maintenance work for historic buildings and archaeological sites is recommended at the same time.

The conservation procedure is also reported as a threat to some properties. In a few cases the Committee requests to develop conservation plans before further major interventions are made. A better recognition of values and their attributes is also demanded. Research and documentation of monuments, surveys of the urban landscape, research and archaeological recording, and condition surveys to gain a **better understanding of a site** were recommended by the World Heritage Committee in some cases.

**Reconstructions** of historic buildings are a quite common issue across the sub-region. Recently, it occurs primarily to properties with religious meaning and is caused in many cases by the change of ownership and use of these properties. In most cases the Committee requests the work to be halted, but the problem is not only fact of reconstruction itself but also the way in which the work has been conducted, its quality, and the final effect.

In the case of natural properties, the **restoration of natural processes**, recording trends in wildlife populations and monitoring of endangered species are the conservation issues. Improvements in these aspects are expected by the World Heritage Committee in its decisions.

Attention should be also paid to the lack of **measures to prevent risks** associated with the occurrence of natural phenomena (e.g. floods or other water hazard) or with these of anthropogenic nature (e.g. fires, presence of invasive species in protected areas etc.) that have been recorded in the reports.

---

difficulties to overcome or the society is not yet ready to take a proactive approach to the heritage protection (the effects of the previous system). The other reason may be that reports only respond to a certain issues, not always going deep enough with an analyses.

## Development pressure

Some of the major issues noted in the state of conservation reports were related to urban development. Lack of effective legislative or regulatory measures for new construction and development, including land-use regulations and control, is a group of most frequently reported problems in the state of conservation reports of the World Heritage properties in most countries of the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region. It can be assumed that it may also be an issue that needs some consideration in countries that have not yet passed through the reactive monitoring process.

**Inappropriate or uncontrolled development** within and around properties is recorded in a number of cases. New buildings are often inconsistent in scale, material and massing. The impact of **high-rise and big volume construction** within buffer zones or even beyond focuses the attention of the World Heritage Committee. In all mentioned cases the Committee requests a moratorium on this kind of development and the implementation of integrated urban polices. Setting zones with certain regulations is also recommended.

There are also cases in which along with new developments **deterioration of historic buildings** and need for rehabilitation of historic quarters are noted. To improve the situation, the implementation of adequate polices to stop unsuitable development and the encouragement of regeneration of historic areas are usually requested by the Committee.

Urban development is often a derivative of investments in tourism and its development. **Tourism pressure** is another issue noted in the state of conservation reports and Committee decisions. It has both direct and indirect impact on the value of World Heritage properties. In most cases the World Heritage properties are the main attractions in the area that attract mass tourism. This involves the development of tourist facilities and transport infrastructure and also changes to social structure and cultural activities. The location and quality of the tourism development is reported as factors affecting the properties, especially natural sites. According to the state of conservation reports, States rather aggressively intervene in regional planning to satisfy the needs of the potential tourists, sometimes forgetting about the inhabitants (changes to law allowing investments). In the cases of existing or potential high tourism pressure, the World Heritage Committee recommends the development and implementation of tourist management plans alone or as a part of a general management plan. The Committee also requests sustainable tourism strategies, medium-term plans for the development of tourist facilities, regulations for tourism activities or plans for reception and control of visitors.

Another source of threat is **mining activity** (oil, gas, ores) and the construction of related infrastructure. This problem has been reported in the majority of cases of natural properties in the sub-region. As mining has been declared inadmissible at World Heritage properties and their setting, the States are requested to introduce restrictions in order to prevent mining at the areas protected under the World Heritage Convention or to suspend already granted permissions. In general, the location of industrial facilities within the buffer zones is considered to be a threat to Outstanding Universal Value. In such situations, the Committee recommends to close or transfer plants to another location.

Landscape protection and **landscape approach** to planning is a weak point in the sub-region. The lack of sensitivity when dealing with landscapes (including townscapes) results in interventions

(changes) not compatible with its character. Physical and functional disturbances (lack of connectivity, fragmentation, miss-location of new constructions etc.) affect the integrity of sites and are a potential threat to the value of properties. In such cases the adoption of landscape or integrated urban polices are requested by the World Heritage Committee. Also, surveys of the urban (cultural) landscapes are recommended in some cases. It may be also concluded that there are barely any regulations allowing integrated protection of cultural and natural values of landscapes.

The effective protection of the World Heritage sites requires **impact studies** for all planned interventions. The request to conduct, submit or revise of already submitted impact study is commonly posed by the World Heritage Committee. By looking at the state of conservation reports, it comes evident that in most countries there is a need to improve legal bases and/or skills that allow for the preparation of Heritage Impact Assessment and also Strategic Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment as standard tools within management systems and spatial planning processes.

### **Legal protection**

Many identified factors affecting properties in the sub-region may be attributed to lack of appropriate **regulation and control mechanisms** or the difficulties in law application. In this matter the situation in the sub-region is extremely diverse. The still ongoing system transformation is differently advanced in individual countries.

The highest possible legal protection should be ensured for every World Heritage property. Certain regulations should be placed for the property and its buffer zone (or setting). Unfortunately inappropriate construction or urban development and uncontrolled growth of various scales are factors affecting many sites in urban areas. In such cases, the Committee requests to strengthen the protection and to establish no-construction zones or strict limits to development rights in certain areas together with control mechanisms. These recommendations are addressed both at the national level to establish or strengthen the heritage protection law as well as at the local level to establish additional regulations in planning documents. The organization of legal protection requires adequate human and financial resources, which is a noticed shortage in some case.

Another issue is new development within protected areas like national parks or nature reserves. This occurs in accordance with applicable regulations, which are insufficient or inadequate to ensure effective protection. New developments mostly take place within the buffer zones, but not exclusively. In such cases, the Committee also requests to strengthen legal protection.

Other serious problems are **illegal direct or indirect actions against heritage**. Illegal demolitions of historic buildings or illegal developments are recorded a few times, particularly in historic cities. Illegal logging and hunting or even illegal sales of land are also noted in the state of conservation reports. In such cases, the World Heritage Committee recommends an adoption of necessary legal regulations and measures at the national or local level to prevent any illegal actions and also to mitigate the negative impact of irreversible situations.

### **Summary**

A major issue reported to the World Heritage Committee is the **organization of World Heritage sites and their management**. In the sub-region, there is a need to break down the barriers

inherent in the governance: new formation of state institutions and introduction of new mechanisms for the coordination of collective action. Promotion of private ownership and a neglect of stakeholding in the situation when partnership is badly needed in all major domains of social activity<sup>9</sup> may be a significant factor. Protection of World Heritage properties is a collective action that requires organization. There is a demanding need for social innovation, **cooperation and co-management** – a conscious responsibility for the present and future state of cultural and natural heritage.

Out of the state of conservation reports it can be also concluded that planning and control of land development is one of the weakest elements of heritage protection in the sub-region. The attention should be paid in the sub-region to address the problems associated with **legal regulations**, and **spatial planning** in particular. World Heritage properties are functioning in spatial and functional relations within a much wider context. Much of their protection is performed through spatial planning tools. As planning is about weighing values and conflict is an inevitable part of it, regulations set in planning documents, constituting local law, are extremely important from this perspective. Legally based and enforced **impact assessments** could be very useful tools in the process of determining acceptable change and good continuation (sustainable development). Development of negotiation skills at management and conservation services levels is crucial.

#### **d. Conclusions**

The most common issues, current for most of the State-Parties in the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region are:

1. Managing area inscribed on the World Heritage List – the lack of management systems or an inefficiency of the existing ones, lack of management plans or an inefficiency of the existing ones, wrong management decisions, lack of cooperation among stakeholders etc.
2. Development pressures within the limits of the World Heritage property and in the setting (buffer zone) – new constructions or reconstructions, functional or physical changes to the sites not corresponding to its character, wrong location or the maladjustment of new facilities to the character of the area/setting etc.

After having examined a representative number of the state of conservation reports and the World Heritage Committee decisions<sup>10</sup> it can be concluded that the directions and main areas of activity aimed at the improvement of the protection of world cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value in the sub-region are:

- the achievement of quality standards relevant to the World Heritage sites keeping in mind that a diversity of approaches should be preserved;
- a stable and effective system of legal protection and the framework for the integrated

---

<sup>9</sup> J. Hausner, *Culture and Transformation*, p.28

<sup>10</sup> Reports on the state of preservation are the primary source of information. They provide information on requirements for World Heritage sites on one hand and show the difficulties, that countries and the World Heritage site managers have to overcome. Mission reports provide relatively thorough analysis of World Heritage sites; its status in broader legal and spatial context and physical condition. However they also have a number of drawbacks and it should be taken into account that in some cases, identification of factors affecting World Heritage properties may be based on incomplete or not fully verified information.

management of cultural and natural heritage, with an emphasis on spatial planning regulations;

- setting a framework and a system of cooperation at the country level and at the level of World Heritage sites allowing the organization of heritage protection and conservation;

- to promote community involvement in the protection of heritage as a value in itself and as a context for the effective protection of heritage;

- implementation of the World Heritage Convention as a tool supporting the legal protection of heritage;

- to overcome the impact of changes in the political and economic system on the perception of own identity and greater cooperation between countries of the sub-region.

#### **4. Results of the first circle of Periodic Reporting exercise in Europe**

The Periodic Reporting on the application of the *World Heritage Convention* is intended to serve four main purposes:

- to provide an assessment of the application of the World Heritage Convention by the State Party;
- to provide an assessment as to whether the World Heritage values of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List are being maintained over time;
- to provide up-dated information about the World Heritage properties to record the changing circumstances and state of conservation of the properties;
- to provide a mechanism for regional cooperation and exchange of information and experiences between States Parties concerning the implementation of the Convention and World Heritage conservation.

The World Heritage Committee has a regional approach to Periodic Reporting. The first circle started in 1998 in the Arab region and ended in 2006 by an examination by the Committee of Regional State of the World Heritage Report for Europe. In the context of this concept paper a summary of the *Report for Europe* is an important point of reference; therefore, key conclusions based on the information gathered during the first Periodic Reporting cycle are presented herein.

For the purpose of the *Report for Europe* the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region was divided into two parts: Central and South-Eastern Europe and Eastern Europe. The results were presented separately for both parts.

##### **Section I of the Periodic Reporting Exercise**

Differences within the sub-region are noted in the section on training within the summary report. Eastern European States Parties have underlined the need for institutional training and the creation of training opportunities for site managers. In South-Eastern European, countries require specialised training in conservation techniques. The States Parties have underlined the need for education in specialised domains such as conservation and preservation of wall paintings, icons, and mosaics, as well as greater competence in languages and computer skills. These countries also require capacity-building of staff, particularly with regard to management planning and mechanisms<sup>11</sup>.

##### **Section II of the Periodic Reporting Exercise**

In general, most European properties have access to experts in numerous fields. The availability of technical expertise is very high in the fields of conservation techniques at both the national and regional levels. In Eastern Europe, however, training is available at an alarmingly low number of sites (2 out of a total of 17 reports for this sub-region).

Gaps in staff training are reported for various areas of expertise, including conservation (especially in Central and South-Eastern Europe); guard training; communication; and visitor management. While a few sites reported that all their training needs were being met, an important number of sites seemed uncertain about their specific needs, or stated that their training needs were not being met<sup>12</sup>.

Looking at the summary of section II of the Periodic Reporting exercise by the strategic objectives, to ensure the effective conservation of World Heritage properties complies with the main purpose of this study. It is noted in the summary that it is essential to develop a culture of preventive

---

<sup>11</sup> Periodic Reporting and Action Plan, Europe 2005-2006, p. 51.

<sup>12</sup> Ibidem, p. 66-68.

conservation and maintenance as well as standards for site management. A major challenge for future action at national and international levels is the need for conservation policies at landscape level and the integration and synergy of natural, cultural, environmental, economic, and tourism policies at all levels of government. There is a need to raise awareness about the values of World Heritage sites and their specificity, as guiding principles for their management.

Answers from the Periodic Reporting questionnaires have demonstrated that concepts of protection and management – particularly the meaning of management systems and management plans – are not well understood. There is a general need to develop approaches, key indicators, benchmarks and best practices in preventive conservation to meet existing threats and raised standards in conservation. The development of monitoring mechanisms for World Heritage related values is an urgent management issue.

The development of tourism - the issues range from limiting and/or targeting tourism flows to promotion and coordination of stakeholders and activities. There is also a need to implement the concept of sustainable tourism. The importance of including the local communities in World Heritage site management is highlighted, and many sites are seeking examples of best practice and guidance in developing collaboration and awareness building with the local community<sup>13</sup>.

Synthesis of the results together with the recommended actions to ensure effective conservation of World Heritage properties are presented below, as they were formulated in the 2006 *Report for Europe*.

## **Synthesis of the results of sections I and II of the Periodic Reports by sub-regions**

### Central and South-Eastern Europe

#### **Strengths**

- *Provision of selected positive administrative and legal measures in the fields of identification, protection, conservation and presentation of World Heritage in the sub-region;*
- *Enhanced World Heritage activities for education, professional training and awareness raising in parts of the sub-region;*
- *Enhanced conservation activities in parts of the sub-region resulting in the removal of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
- *Increased interest of governments and the general public towards the World Heritage Convention and World Heritage properties;*
- *Growing and recent involvement of local communities in the conservation process;*
- *Ongoing European Union integration processes contributing towards sub-regional or regional cooperation.*

#### **Weaknesses**

- *Lack of heritage policies in the sub-region or the implementation of existing policies;*
- *Inadequate legal protection for World Heritage;*
- *Loss of institutional memory and documentation;*
- *Damage to the heritage from political conflict in parts of the sub-region;*
- *Inadequate capacity building and training in the institutions and of individuals involved in the World Heritage;*
- *Inadequate funding in the field of heritage;*
- *Inadequate representation of heritage of the sub-region on the World Heritage List and lack of adequate inventories in parts of the sub-region;*
- *Overall lack of national and sub-regional strategy for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention;*
- *Difficulties in developing focused strategies for the sub-region because of different needs resulting from the political and historical background in each country.*

### Eastern Europe

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibidem, p. 78

## **Strengths**

- *Provision of selected positive administrative and legal measures in the field of identification, protection, conservation*
- *and presentation of World Heritage in the sub-region;*
- *Increased interest of governments and the general public towards the World Heritage Convention and World Heritage properties;*
- *Growing participation of NGOs in the field of heritage conservation;*
- *Positive impacts of ratification of the World Heritage Convention on the safeguarding of national heritage.*

## **Weaknesses**

- *Lack of heritage policies in the sub-region or the implementation of existing policies;*
- *Inadequate legal protection of World Heritage;*
- *Lack of capacity and training in the institutions and of individuals involved in World Heritage;*
- *Gaps in conservation techniques and professional skills;*
- *Inadequate funding in the field of heritage;*
- *Inadequate representation of heritage of the sub-region on the World Heritage List.*
- *Overall lack of national and sub-regional strategy for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.*

## **Recommended actions for World Heritage to ensure the effective conservation of World Heritage properties**

### Central and South-Eastern Europe

#### *1. Develop preventive and proactive approaches to conservation:*

- *by involving all stakeholders and integrating them into management issues*
- *by integrating World Heritage management into national, regional and local planning mechanisms*
- *by integrating conservation and development initiatives*
- *by integrating (protective) measures for cultural and natural values*

*2. Ensure that national institutions responsible for (natural and cultural) heritage protection and Ministries of Foreign Affairs of the State Parties further review their whole legal base in order to define the strengths and weaknesses of international cooperation in the field of heritage conservation and develop general policies for future actions in this realm.*

*3. Ensure effective management by establishing adequate monitoring systems relying on the identification and use of site-specific indicators, including those related to tourism.*

*4. Ensure adequate staffing (both in number and qualification), material/technical equipment with (sustainable) financial sources according to specific needs of World Heritage properties.*

### Eastern Europe

*1. Define integrated policies for the conservation of both cultural and natural World Heritage*

*2. Reform existing heritage legislations*

*3. Design a sub-regional programme aiming to help States Parties establish the effective management mechanisms for the cultural and natural properties*

*4. Establish appropriate management plans for all inscribed properties*

*5. Enhance cooperation between States Parties in the fields of heritage protection and conservation located on their territories, in particular in the case of shared heritage*

*6. Develop scientific studies and research programmes specific to World Heritage*



## **Conclusions**

Taking into account the results of the reports and decisions on the conservation status of the World Heritage properties and nomination decisions, it is worth noting that many of the issues identified in the first cycle of Periodic Reporting are still present and proposed actions are still valued.

## 5. World Heritage Strategy for Capacity-Building

*World Heritage Strategy for Capacity-Building* was adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2011 (Decision 35 COM 9B)<sup>14</sup>. Following UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), the strategy defines capacity a “the ability of individuals, organizations and societies to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve objectives in a sustainable manner”<sup>15</sup>. Capacity building is seen as a form of people-centered change that entails working with groups of individuals to achieve improvements in approaches to managing cultural and natural heritage.

The WHCB Strategy provides a framework of action, and orients actors at the international, regional, or national levels to create regional and national capacity building strategies in addition to individual capacity building activities. It proposes two paradigm shifts. The first one is from training to capacity building (from „knowledge transfer” to „knowledge acquisition”). The second aims at connecting capacity building for cultural and natural heritage.

One of the bases for the WHCB Strategy was an analysis of the State of Conservation Reports of the 158 World Heritage properties examined by the World Heritage Committee in 2008. It became clear out of it that problems such as the *„isolation of heritage concerns from other sectors continues to penalize heritage practice just as isolated heritage management decision-making penalizes the relationship of heritage to its context. This becomes an acute problem when the factors hindering effective management of World Heritage properties come more and more from beyond the confines of the site, and the heritage manager in place, however good, has limited capacity to forge change.”* According to the strategy key themes that should be taken into account include:

- disaster risk reduction,
- sustainable tourism,
- heritage impact assessment,
- management effectiveness,
- involvement of communities, NGOs, and other stakeholders in the management process,
- strengthening legal and administrative frameworks at the national level,
- better awareness of the World Heritage Convention in the general population,
- better integration of World Heritage processes into other related planning mechanisms.

The WHCB Strategy states that capacity building for the effective management of World Heritage properties should be aimed at:

- strengthening the knowledge, abilities, skills and behaviour of people with direct responsibilities for heritage conservation and management,
- improving institutional structures and processes through empowering decision-makers and policy-makers,
- and introducing a more dynamic relationship between heritage and its context and, in turn, greater reciprocal benefits by a more inclusive approach.

It also defines main target audience groups, which are:

- practitioners (including individuals and groups who directly intervene in the conservation and management of World Heritage properties):

---

<sup>14</sup> The strategy is a revision of the Global Training Strategy for Cultural and Natural Heritage presented and approved at the 25<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee in 2001 (Finland).

<sup>15</sup> UNDP Capacity Development Practice Note, April 2006 (accessed 5 July 2010), p. 3; Document available at: [http://www.undp.org/cpr/iasc/content/docs/UNDP\\_Capacity\\_Development.pdf](http://www.undp.org/cpr/iasc/content/docs/UNDP_Capacity_Development.pdf)

- institutions (including State Party heritage organizations, NGOs, the World Heritage Committee, Advisory Bodies and others institutions that have a responsibility for the enabling environment for management and conservation)
- communities and networks (including local communities living on or near properties as well as the larger networks that nurture them)

For the identified audience groups the WHCB Strategy defines principal learning areas, which are:

#### Practitioners:

- implementation of the Convention (Tentative lists, Nomination etc.)
- conservation and management issues: planning, implementation and monitoring
- technical and scientific issues
- traditional conservation processes at the site level
- resource utilization and management

#### Institutions:

- legislative issues
- institutional frameworks/issues (Governance, decentralization)
- financial issues
- human resources
- knowledge

#### Communities and networks:

- reciprocal benefits and linking with sustainable development and communities
- stewardship
- ongoing sustainability of traditional conservation processes
- communication / Interpretation

The Strategy involves the development of regional strategies for capacity building aimed at improving protection, conservation and presentation of World Heritage and further going to the national level determining additional goals and setting a range of activities.

#### Vision of the WHCB Strategy

***Practitioners, institutions, communities and networks are enlightened, capable and closely aligned in their work to protect World Heritage, and heritage in general, and to give it a positive role in the life of communities. Through the capacity activities:***

- *practitioners will be able to better protect and manage World Heritage,*
- *institutions will be capable of providing support for effective conservation and management through favourable legislation and policies, establishing a more effective administrative set-up and providing financial and human resources for heritage protection,*
- *communities and networks will be aware of the importance of heritage and support its conservation.*

### **Sub-regional approach to the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy**

As part of the overall strategy of capacity-building, efforts have been undertaken to develop a strategy of capacity-building for the sub-region of Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe. A conceptual framework has been developed in a *Blueprint elaborated jointly by the Steering Group, established at the Periodic Reporting workshop in Tbilisi in November 2012, the Advisory Body*

The Blueprint sets out the vision of the sub-regional capacity-building strategy, presents a summary of the outcomes of the Training and Capacity-Building questionnaire and proposes some preliminary suggestions and ideas for the development and implementation of the strategy. Training needs that have been ranked as the most pressing are as follows:

1. Site management / improving management skills
2. Conservation, with special attention for sustainability and the use of (new) techniques
3. Monitoring preparedness
4. Risk preparedness
5. Community involvement
6. Participatory management (communication, negotiation, conflict management)
7. Fundraising / resource management / revenue sharing
8. Basic training regarding the World Heritage Convention, management and sustainable development of the World Heritage site
9. Interpretation / awareness raising

It has been also pointed out that integrated and cross-professional training are a serious need in the sub-region, especially concerning both natural and cultural heritage.

There are also priority target audiences for training and capacity-building activities identified. These are:

- professionals (both private sector and heritage officials),
- local communities (based on an agreed concept of local communities),
- institutions (both NGO's and GO's),
- governments/politicians/decision-makers,
- practitioners,
- teachers.

Additional considerations, as highlighted by the National Focal Points, that should be taken into account during the development of the capacity-building strategy are as follows:

- improve the cooperation between national and site level;
- improve management / create an effective management system;
- ensure that the information / training reaches the level of site manager;
- involve all stakeholders in World Heritage issues from as early as possible and on a continuous basis, not just once;
- emphasise international exchange of knowledge and experiences;
- less costly training methods
- should be explored so that their continuity can be ensured;
- identify financial resources and provide a systematic funding scheme for the implementation of capacity-building strategy;
- communication and the heritage professionals' ability to involve general public/community into heritage preservation and to steer towards the common understanding of heritage as a whole society's benefit;
- training activities/programmes interlinking the cultural and natural heritage;
- keep the close interconnection with the global strategy and vital cooperation with other/neighbouring regions;

- the importance of co-operation with other States Parties, open to other sub-regions.

*The Report from the meeting of the focal Points for World Heritage from Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe in the framework of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting, Baku (Azerbaijan), 28-31 October 2013* provides additional information for the capacity-building needs in the sub-region. Analysis of the information provided by the focal points with focus on the implementation of the WH Committee Strategic Objective („the 5C”) in the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe (by a questionnaire) is an important overview of the sub-regional context, and in particular of the national strategies, achievements, challenges, needs and proposals concerning the implementation of the Convention in the sub-region.

Major obstacles identified by Focal Points of the CESEE countries are<sup>16</sup>:

- lack of understanding by CESEE heritage professionals, decision-makers and site managers of core concepts of the World Heritage Convention such as Outstanding Universal Value, integrity, and authenticity,
- lack of cooperation between stakeholders,
- lack of funds,
- lack of involvement of local communities,
- lack of integration of heritage issues into broader planning and development schemes (which causes major conflicts between development and conservation),
- lack of institutional continuity/memory.

It's worth noting that, as reported by the Focal Points, there are two main ongoing processes in the CESEE countries that have direct impact on state of conservation of the properties. These are revisions of legal and institutional frameworks and reorganization of the state institutions.

The collected information, studies and reports are an important source of data for building sub-regional strategy for capacity-building on World Heritage. It is worth noting that the individual studies are consistent in assessing the situation; however priorities, direction, and fields of activity are yet to be determined.

---

<sup>16</sup> Anna Sidorenko, *Implementation of “the 5Cs” Strategic Objectives with support of WH Thematic Programmes and Initiatives: Focus on CESEE*, Workshop of National Focal Points of Central, South-East and Eastern European Countries, Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise, Baku, Azerbaijan, 29 – 31 October 2013

## 6. Recommendations for the capacity-building strategy for the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region

State-Parties to the World Heritage Convention are responsible for ensuring the protection, conservation and presentation of cultural and natural heritage having Outstanding Universal Value (art. 4 of the Convention). According to the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, par. 96, 97 and 111 Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties, including the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity at the time of inscription, have to be sustained or enhanced over time. For that reason the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List must have clearly delineated boundaries and adequate long-term legislative, regulatory, institutional and/or traditional protection and effective management systems with common elements, which could include:

- a thorough shared understanding of the property by all stakeholders;
- a cycle of planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and feedback;
- the monitoring and assessment of the impacts of trends, changes, and of proposed interventions;
- the involvement of partners and stakeholders;
- the allocation of necessary resources;
- capacity-building; and
- an accountable, transparent description of how the management system functions.

The overarching goal is effective management of World Heritage properties, enabling protection of its Outstanding Universal Value:

- quality of World Heritage properties is safeguarded, and
- properties play a valued role in the local communities' life.

Having analysed the state of conservation reports and decisions on nominations from the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region it may be concluded that there is a fundamental problem with an organisation of World Heritage sites and legal measure to plan and control development.

Main objective for a capacity-building strategy in the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region (as in other sub-regions) is to cause that the managers and stakeholders are properly qualified to face complex realities and deal with the changing environment and circumstances at a World Heritage site. To achieve the goal the following are required:

1. Understanding of the World Heritage Convention, the World Heritage List, and the concept of a World Heritage property – defining elements: OUV and its attributes, authenticity and integrity; approach to protection, conservation and management; procedures; etc.
2. Legal bases for an effective heritage protection, conducted in a sustainable and inclusive/participatory way (legal tools and measures, clear procedures, etc.), especially for ensembles and sites/areas.
3. Political will and community engagement – awareness of the role heritage plays in development (cultural, social, scientific, economic).
4. Appropriate conservation, planning, management, social skills (soft skills), etc.; different sets of skills depending on scope of duties and a place/role in a management system.
5. Demand for a quality interventions/designs in a heritage area/structure.

## **Suggested directions and main areas of activity for capacity-building strategy in the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region**

Identify needs for capacity building fall into two main groups. The first one refers to the management of particular property and can be handled within ongoing management activities. Resolution of the issues from the second group can be only achieved by bringing external stakeholders and decisions at local or national level that create a favourable environment for quality management of World Heritage properties.

Further four main target groups are possible to identify:

### 1. Managers of World Heritage sites (partners in management of World Heritage properties)

knowledge (theory) – awareness raising activities

- World Heritage Convention
- principles of organisation and management of World Heritage sites
- quality of protection and conservation – conservation doctrine and practice
- environmental/heritage impact assessments

abilities (practice) – capacity building activities

- strategic thinking and planning skills
- negotiation skills and ability to act in a conflict situation
- ability to cooperate in an effective way
- cooperation and communication skills for cross-sectors and multi professional cooperation
- managing a protected area – planning, implementation, monitoring and review

### 2. Local authorities / local government officers

knowledge (theory) – awareness raising activities

- World Heritage Convention
- role of heritage for development and for local community
- integrated approach to planning, including protection of heritage in local development plans
- landscape approach to protection and conservation of sites
- environmental/heritage impact assessments

### 3. Professionals – conservators / planners / architects etc.

knowledge (theory) – awareness raising activities

- World Heritage Convention
- principles for organisation and management of World Heritage sites
- quality of protection and conservation – conservation doctrine and practice
- environmental/heritage impact assessments

abilities (practice) – capacity building activities

- conservation of different fabrics
- landscape approach to protection and conservation of sites
- spatial planning and integrated approach to management of space/land
- environmental/heritage impact assessments
- designing for protected areas (new interventions or adjustments for new or extended functions, etc.)

#### 4. Central institutions / heritage officers

knowledge (theory) – awareness raising activities

- World Heritage Convention
- law of heritage protection
- principles for organisation and management of World Heritage sites
- quality of protection and conservation – conservation doctrine and practice
- conservation of different fabrics
- environmental/heritage impact assessments

abilities (practice) – capacity building activities

- World Heritage Convention
- legal heritage protection
- landscape approach to protection and conservation of sites
- cross-sectors and multi professional cooperation and communication
- negotiation skills and ability to act in a conflict situation

Programmes for capacity building need to be developed within the agreed *World Heritage Strategy for Capacity-Building*. The attached table has a selection of goals and actions which are most relevant for the Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region.



Suggested high-level goals/ actions for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region Capacity Building Strategy

(taken from Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage)

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
<b>Credibility</b>				
10. The Convention is understood and achieves overall positive benefit to conservation while avoiding negative impacts	1.1 Creation of specific training and communication tools and opportunities to explain the key concepts and processes of the World Heritage Convention effectively and consistently, to ensure that all States Parties and all actors in the Convention, including local communities, appreciate and are able to make the most effective and sustainable use of the Convention to support cultural and natural heritage conservation.	PIC	ABs, WHC, C2Cs, States Parties	It should reach as broad audience as possible.
	1.2 A set of indicators are developed based on State of Conservation reporting process and other monitoring and management effectiveness processes to identify positive and negative trends for conservation of cultural and natural heritage.	PIC	ABs, WHC, C2Cs	It is a very useful approach in order to identify needs which should be promoted at the regional and individual State Parties levels.  State Parties should be also considered as potential implementation partners.

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
	1.3 Issues related to the World Heritage Convention are included within degree programmes and long vocational courses to ensure that professionals being trained have a better basic awareness of the World Heritage Convention and its strengths and weaknesses.	P	ICCROM, University Programmes, C2Cs, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, FUUH	<p>State Parties may be also potential implementation partners.</p> <p>Institutions should be also considered as potential audience, as they organise/may organise courses.</p> <p>There is a question of how to achieve a quality of these courses if organised within capacity of State Parties or through the university programmes (relevant, updated information on the World Heritage Convention).</p>
11. A more balanced World Heritage List is achieved, and fewer nominations suffer serious problems following their submission				
	2.3 Increased and more effective support is provided to States Parties on tentative list creation with a priority given to strengthen capacity in countries with limited representation on the World Heritage List.	I	ABs, C2Cs	
	2.4 Prioritized thematic studies and other tools are created that assist in the identification of appropriate, prioritized tentative lists, and the harmonization of lists within regions and/or themes as appropriate.	I	ABs	?

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
	2.7 Specific guidance and related training and tools are created in order to support more effective community participation processes within the preparation of nominations.	PIC	ABs, C2Cs, regional training partners, States Parties	This is relevant also for managing a property after inscription, as in many cases nominations were developed without proper engagement of local communities.
	2.8 The network of specialists able to advise States Parties within Advisory Bodies and their networks is expanded.	PI	ABs	This is relevant also for conservation and management needs (advisory missions).
<b>Conservation</b>				
12. National Institutions are effective in the identification, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage	3.1 A series of guidance documents are developed to assist States to assess their capacity and identify and advocate for strengthened capacity at national level. Topics should include: a) legal frameworks and their application; b) improvement of advocacy in national decision-making processes (including the capacity of non-heritage ministries to participate in the goals of the World Heritage Convention), c) the ability of heritage institutions to obtain accorded appropriate resources to function effectively.	I	ABs, C2Cs, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs	Practitioners should also be considered as potential audience, as they may influence organisation of or organise programmes and courses.  State Parties may be potential implementation partners.
	3.2 National strategies for institutional and professional capacity strengthening are developed and put in place, in response to needs identified in the first and second cycles of periodic reporting. (See Point 12 below)	I	States Parties	State Parties may need help or cooperation in development of strategies.

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
	3.3 Training materials and activities are developed and implemented to increase the capacity of national institutions to improve conservation and management of the heritage	I	States Parties, ABs, WHC, C2Cs	
	3.4 Focused mid career training is provided to support professional development of nature and culture professionals within national heritage institutions, including ministries, government agencies and NGOs.	PI	ICCROM, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, C2Cs, University programmes	State Parties may be potential implementation partners.
	3.6 Effective management and conservation tools are developed for use at the national level, including: a) systems for assessment of developments and projects in terms of their impacts on natural and cultural heritage (EIA for example), b) integrated national and property level planning related to disaster risk reduction for heritage	I	ABs, WHC, C2Cs, States Parties	Practitioners should also be considered as potential audience
	3.7 Focused training is provided for key stakeholders in the tourism industry and other sectors which impact on the protection of World Heritage (both public and private) on appropriate conservation and sustainable development needs in relation to their specific sectors at World Heritage Sites (and potential World Heritage Sites).	PIC	C2Cs, regional training partners, States Parties	
13. Effective				

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
sustainable management and conservation of World Heritage occurs, taking into account the dynamics of specific local contexts and settings within the larger framework of global WH processes.	4.3 Training on management of World Heritage properties is developed and implemented to strengthen planning and management skills including methodologies and tools for assessment of Management Effectiveness linked to clear indicators.	PI	ICCROM, C2Cs, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, University Programmes, States Parties	In case of cultural landscapes communities should also be considered as potential audience.
	4.5 Training on disaster risk management at World Heritage properties is developed and implemented to strengthen planning and response to both natural and man-made disasters.	PIC	ABs, WHC, C2Cs, States Parties	
	4.6 A network of up to 20 classroom sites are identified within the World Heritage List, with appropriate balance of regions and site types, to provide venues for in-field training using models of good practice in site management.	PI	ABs, WHC, States Parties	In addition, existing World Heritage properties could be involved in the preparation of new nominations.  Communities should also be considered as potential audience.
	4.7 A prioritized programme of research on management and conservation needs of World Heritage properties is carried out, based on information coming from periodic reporting, SOC reports, overall assessments of SOC trends, and results of management effectiveness assessments.	PI	UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, C2Cs, University programmes, FUUH	

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
	4.9 Mechanisms are developed to respond in a timely manner to help States Parties address issues arising from the State of Conservation process and other relevant Committee decisions.	I	WHC, ABs, C2Cs, States Parties	There is a need for parallel actions at the State Parties side - State Parties should develop mechanisms to use the international assistance (reactive monitoring process and advisory missions).
14. Skills for conservation of cultural and natural heritage are strengthened.	5.1 Availability of appropriately skilled individuals with particular conservation skills is evaluated at Regional Periodic Reporting meetings and at the national level	PI	ABs, WHC, C2Cs, States Parties	
	5.2 Training activities are designed and implemented to improve identified areas of skills shortages, or emerging needs for skills to face new challenges.	PC	ABs, C2Cs, regional training partners, university partners	Institutions should also be considered as potential audience.  State Parties may be potential implementation partners.
	5.3 Networks of expertise are strengthened to bring together conservation practitioners and community groups to both promote mutual learning, and also better identify future capacity building needs.	PC	States Parties	Institutions should also be considered as potential audience.
15. The availability of funding and other resources to meet conservation needs	6.1 A network of partners at the site level (site managers and others involved at the site) is created to work together to support priority conservation needs at properties, identified through all management effectiveness and monitoring processes.	PIC	States Parties	

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
in World Heritage Sites is significantly enhanced	6.2 Tools are developed to enable States Parties to more effectively use the International Assistance process to improve conservation and management at World Heritage properties.	I	ABs, WHC	
	6.3 Tools are developed to enhance the ability of States Parties and site managers to request and secure extra-budgetary funding from a variety of sources.	I	ABs, WHC, C2Cs, regional training partners	
<b>Community</b>				
16. Greater mutual benefits to communities and their heritage results through sustainable development associated with World Heritage Properties	7.1 Targeted research on benefits and best practices for the integration of World Heritage conservation and sustainable development goals for communities is undertaken to provide examples and case studies of successful practice for use throughout the World Heritage system.	IC	University programmes, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, C2Cs, FUUH	Practitioners should also be considered as potential audience.  State Parties may be potential implementation partners.
	7.2 Training and capacity building activities are designed and implemented for national and local institutions, World Heritage site managers, and other stakeholders to integrate heritage conservation and development goals in related sectors (nature, culture, tourism, and development).	PIC	C2Cs, States Parties, regional training partners	

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
	7.3 Research and best practices in sustainable tourism, including those which are based on participatory processes, are undertaken to encourage the tourism sector to contribute in a positive way to the protection of World Heritage properties and the development of communities.	PIC	University programmes, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, C2Cs, FUUH	
	7.4 Networks of World Heritage properties are created at the national level, and where appropriate among neighboring countries, in order to enhance the capacity of these properties to contribute to development activities at national and regional scales	IC	States Parties	
17. Greater and inclusive participation of local communities in heritage conservation, presentation and associated development.	8.1 Research on effective approaches for community engagement and participation including lessons learned within World Heritage properties is undertaken as a basis for identifying successful examples to be used for capacity building and learning between properties.	PIC	University programmes, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, C2Cs, FUUH	
	8.2 A series of tools for outreach and capacity building are designed and diffused to build the capacity of communities to understand and participate in the World Heritage Convention.	C	ABs, WHC, University programmes, UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs, C2Cs, FUUH	Practitioners and institutions should also be considered as potential audience.  State Parties may be potential implementation partners.



<b>Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage</b>				<b>Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage</b>
<b>Goal</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Audience:</b> Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	<b>Potential Implementation Partners</b>	
	8.3 Local communities, and other stakeholders, working with site managers, are encouraged to actively participate in the protection and presentation of World Heritage properties.	IC	States Parties	Practitioners should also be considered as potential audience.
	8.4 Basic information on the World Heritage Convention is made available on-line and in printed form in as many languages as possible.	C	WHC	State Parties should be encouraged to make information on World Heritage Convention and the List available on-line.  Practitioners and institutions should also be considered as potential audience.
<b>Communication</b>				
18. Increased awareness of the need for and benefits from heritage conservation and the contribution	9.1 Tools will be designed and made available to strengthen the capacity of States Parties and World Heritage site managers to present World Heritage on site and at a more general level, supported by effective and appropriate guidance on the use of the World Heritage Emblem and brand.	PI	WHC, ABs, States Parties, C2Cs, UNESCO Chairs, University programmes	

Capacity-Building Strategy for World Heritage				Specific action for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe sub-region and relevant comments at this stage
Goal	Action	Audience: Practitioners (P) Institutions (I) Communities (C)	Potential Implementation Partners	
of the World Heritage Convention to achieving this.	9.2 The inclusion of the World Heritage Convention as a component of school curricula continues to be promoted, and facilitated by an active programme of communication and preparation and dissemination of resources on World Heritage for schools via the programmes of UNESCO and via curricula development on national levels.	C	WHC, States Parties, University Programmes (focusing on primary and secondary education)	Practitioners and institutions should also be considered as potential audience.

Capacity Building: Enhancing the System		Lead Responsibility	
10. Beyond the contribution of capacity building to achieving positive results for the other 4 “Cs” of the strategic directions of the World Heritage Convention, new approaches are needed to ensure that the World Heritage Capacity	10.3 Effective communication between providers of capacity building and with the audiences / beneficiaries is put in place to ensure coordination and encourage actors to contribute as part of the broader activities of the strategy.	ICCROM	State Parties may be potential partners.
	10.5 A programme of translation and dissemination of a range of documents is instituted to ensure that information is reaching a wide range of stakeholders.	ICCROM, IUCN, and ICOMOS	State Parties may be potential partners.
	10.6 New learning environments and means of provision and dissemination of information are researched and pilot projects implemented (on-line tools, short videos, etc.)	ICCROM, IUCN, and ICOMOS	State Parties may be potential partners.

<b>Capacity Building: Enhancing the System</b>		<b>Lead Responsibility</b>	
Building itself, is effective and is able to report results to the World Heritage Committee and other stakeholders.	10.7 Regional strategies and programmes for each region are put in place (including sub-regional, and national approaches where appropriate) to strategically plan and implement capacity building. These plans are based on the results of periodic reporting exercises, and other regional needs assessments and programmes concerning cultural and natural heritage as appropriate, integrating the efforts of ICCROM, IUCN, ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre, Regionally focused category 2 centres and relevant regional bodies. The proposed timeline and strategy development process for these regional strategies are shown below.	ICCROM with C2Cs, and regional training partners	
	10.8 Fundraising is planned and carried out to ensure that there are resources to enable the implementation of the capacity building strategy. Sources of funds could include increased contributions to capacity building from the World Heritage Fund, and extra-budgetary funding by States Parties to the Convention, and new external partners.	World Heritage Committee and States Parties	