

# SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING IN EUROPE

## Sub-Regional Reflection Sessions

### Nordic & Baltic Europe

2 December 2014 – Fortress of Suomenlinna, Helsinki

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)

Objectives	Responsibility					Comments
	WH Committee	WHC	Advisory Bodies	States Parties	Site Manag <sup>r</sup>	
<b>Strategic Objective: Strengthen the Credibility of the World Heritage List</b>						
Promote meetings and workshops on the implementation of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> and its concepts (at sub-regional, national and local level) based on the new <i>Operational Guidelines</i>		X	X	X		
Promote sub-regional harmonisation of Tentative Lists to achieve a better balanced and representative World Heritage List		X		X		
Promote the participation of local authorities and different stakeholders in the identification and nomination of World Heritage sites				X	X	

Objectives	Responsibility					Comments
	WH Committee	WHC	Advisory Bodies	States Parties	Site Manag <sup>t</sup>	
<b>Strategic Objective: Ensure the Effective Conservation of World Heritage Properties</b>						
Enhance cooperation with the European Union and the Council of Europe	X	X		X		
Promote sub-regional cooperation for EU-funding		X		X		
Establish special national grants earmarked for World Heritage sites				X		
Consider certain amendments to national legislation to enhance management and protection of World Heritage sites				X		
Ensure the mainstreaming of World Heritage in national, regional, and local planning processes				X	X	
Strengthen cooperation between natural and cultural heritage agencies			X	X		
Strengthen the implementation of the new <i>Operational Guidelines</i>		X	X	X		
Develop mechanisms for simplifying access to World Heritage documentation, and take measures to secure institutional memory		X		X	X	
Develop and revise management plans in accordance with new requirements				X	X	
Revise boundaries and buffer zones at World Heritage sites, if needed				X	X	
Develop methodologies, criteria and guidelines for the management of buffer zones		X	X	X		
Develop and implement monitoring methodologies, criteria and indicators		X	X	X		
Consider the use of new technology in the monitoring process			X	X	X	
Ensure that visitor/tourism management plans exist at all relevant sites				X	X	
<b>Strategic Objective: Promote the Development of Effective Capacity Building in the States Parties</b>						
Encourage the development of sub-regional networks for relevant capacity-building initiatives		X	X	X		
Facilitate training in the basic concepts of the <i>World Heritage Convention</i> , such as 'outstanding universal value' and Statement of Significance		X	X	X		
Facilitate training on the development of management plans and monitoring systems		X	X	X		
Promote cooperation and exchange of experiences at sub-regional, national and local level		X	X	X	X	
Strengthen existing capacity building networks		X	X	X		
Use highly qualified World Heritage expertise (IUCN, ICOMOS, ICCROM) when needed			X	X		
Provide the States Parties with manuals, promotion material, best practices etc		X	X			

Objectives	Responsibility					Comments
	WH Committee	WHC	Advisory Bodies	States Parties	Site Manag <sup>t</sup>	
Develop a tool-kit for site managers		X	X			
Develop sub-regional and national strategies for scientific research		X		X		
Encourage international and interdisciplinary research on World Heritage related topics		X		X		
Systematically collect scientific studies relevant to World Heritage work and make them available to relevant parties		X		X		
<b>Strategic Objective: Increase Public Awareness, Involvement and Support for World Heritage through Communication</b>						
Identify information channels for reaching relevant groups at local, national and international levels		X		X	X	
Establish mechanisms for effective communication between site, national and UNESCO levels		X		X	X	
Develop appropriate information material for defined target groups		X		X	X	
Develop information material encouraging sustainable tourism, such as a 'Code of Conduct'		X		X	X	
Establish websites for all World Heritage sites focusing on World Heritage issues				X	X	
Develop sub-regional and national strategies for education		X	X	X		
Strengthen higher level education for heritage conservation and management				X		
Include heritage education in established school curricula.				X		
Promote participation in 'World Heritage in Young Hands'		X		X		
Distribute information on the results of the Periodic Reporting exercise to relevant stakeholders		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

## MAIN PRIORITIES, ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE WAY FORWARD FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR WORLD HERITAGE IN THE NORDIC-BALTIC SUB-REGION

Author: Nordic World Heritage Foundation.

See also **Annex I** for the complete Study.

Capacity building is key to sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties, and the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy is an obvious starting point. Identifying the main threats and issues affecting the properties in the sub-region, by analysis of PR, SOC-reports, meetings and consultations, highlights the key issues that needs focus in the following years to support States Parties and stakeholders to improve the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Nordic-Baltic sub-region. These preliminary results would need to be considered and reviewed in light of the final results of the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting and also through consultations with States Parties and relevant stakeholders in the sub-region. The PR meeting in Helsinki 1-2 December 2014 will present results and recommendations for the Second Cycle PR in Europe and provide important inputs towards capacity building and World Heritage in Europe and the sub-regions. The sub-region should aim to map its existing capacities and resources towards addressing the main needs identified in this report and further collaborate on developing a future capacity-building programme.

The World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy and the goals and actions identified therein will form the foundation for a sub-regional strategy to enhance conservation, protection and management, and the overall implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the States Parties. Based on the analysis above, the following overall goals in the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy must be considered in detail in the future development of action plans and capacity building programmes concerning the Nordic-Baltic sub-region:

Goal	
<b>Credibility</b>	1. The Convention is understood and achieves overall positive benefit to conservation while avoiding negative impacts.
<b>Conservation</b>	3. National Institutions are effective in the identification, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage.
	4. Effective sustainable management and conservation of WH occurs, taking into account the dynamics of specific local contexts and settings within the larger framework of global WH processes.
	5. Skills for conservation of cultural and natural heritage are strengthened.
	6. The availability of funding and other resources to meet conservation needs in World Heritage Sites is significantly enhanced.
<b>Community</b>	7. Greater mutual benefits to communities and their heritage results through sustainable development associated with World Heritage Properties.
	8. Greater and inclusive participation of local communities in heritage conservation, presentation and associated development.
<b>Communication</b>	9. Increased awareness of the need for and benefits from heritage conservation and the contribution of the World Heritage Convention to achieving this.

# ANNEX 1

**DESK STUDY on  
CAPACITY-BUILDING NEEDS  
in the Nordic-Baltic Sub-Region, Europe**

**Nordic World Heritage Foundation, Oslo, Norway**

**Desk Study prepared  
for the UNESCO World Heritage Centre  
Europe and North America Unit**

**November 2014**



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization



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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary	3
2. Background	4
3. Trends: Challenges and issues in the Nordic-Baltic sub-region 2006-2014	8
4. Main priorities, actions and recommendations on the way forward for Capacity-building for World Heritage in the Nordic-Baltic sub-region	12
ANNEX I Decisions from the World Heritage Committee considered for the desk study and corresponding documents (SOCs and Nomination files)	13
ANNEX II Table: SOC reports with threats	15
ANNEX III Bibliography and related documents	16

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of the Nordic World Heritage Foundations' (NWHF) contributions to support the implementation of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in Europe, this desk study aims to provide an overview of the capacity-building needs concerning the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Nordic-Baltic sub-region, both at national and site levels.

NWHF was mandated to act as a Focal Point, Facilitator and Coordinator of the Second Cycle of PR in the Nordic-Baltic sub-region and considers the PR exercise an excellent arena for capacity building, which is the key to sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties. This desk study is developed within the framework of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting (PR) in Europe, using the questionnaires submitted 2013-2014 as the main source of information. In identifying the main threats and issues affecting the WH properties in the sub-region, other sources, such as research and analysis from SOC databases (both sub-regional and regional), nomination files and Advisory or Reactive monitoring mission reports, outcomes and recommendations from meetings throughout this process, as well as data and statistical analysis from the IUCN Outlook database, have all been taken into consideration.

Based on the analyses in this desk study, the following priorities to strengthen capacity-building in the Nordic-Baltic sub-region have been identified: **Management Systems/ Management Plans, Balance between Development and World Heritage, Stakeholder involvement, Sustainable Tourism and Risk Preparedness**. These priorities are based on the main threats and issues affecting the properties in the sub-region. It is worth noting that the abovementioned priorities consist of weaknesses which in many regards correspond to the results found in the First Cycle PR exercise for the Nordic-Baltic sub-region.

Through identification of the main threats and issues affecting the properties in the sub-region, this desk study highlights key issues that need focus in the following years to support States Parties and stakeholders to improve implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Nordic-Baltic sub-region. The preliminary results of capacity-building needs recognised in this desk study should be considered and reviewed in light of the final results of the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting, and also through consultations with States Parties and relevant stakeholders in the sub-region.

## 2. BACKGROUND

The analyses, findings and conclusions in this desk study aims to provide an overview of the capacity-building needs concerning the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Nordic-Baltic sub-region, both at national and site levels. This desk study is developed within the framework of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting (PR) in Europe, and is one of the Nordic World Heritage Foundation's (NWHF) contributions to support the Europe and North America Unit of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre in this exercise. NWHF has contributed to facilitate the PR process and provided capacity-building for States Parties and Site Managers in the region. NWHF has further developed models for analysis and participates in the expert group for drafting of the Periodic Report and related follow-up Action Plans for Europe.

NWHF considers it essential that the findings and recommendations of PR are translated into actions to improve the implementation of the Convention and the State of Conservation (SOC) of the World Heritage (WH) sites in the sub-region. Capacity-building is an essential tool to achieve these aims and a priority area for the World Heritage Committee, the Advisory Bodies, The World Heritage Centre and NWHF, as reflected in the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy, developed by the Advisory Bodies and adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, Paris, 2011, Decision 35COM9.B).

The analyses in this report covers the period since the First Cycle of the PR (finalised 2006). The Second Cycle PR report for Europe will be presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in Bonn, 2015. The PR report to the Committee will be accompanied by an Outcomes publication, which will include main conclusions, trends, lessons learnt and future opportunities, as proposed by the World Heritage Centre at the Periodic Reporting Mid-cycle Review Meeting in November 2013.

The PR exercise is based on self-evaluation, and can therefore be a practical and guiding tool for the everyday conservation and management of World Heritage. Consequently, it is crucial to clearly identify challenges and issues and present clear results and recommendations, and further to provide suggestions for measures in response to the needs highlighted by States Parties, site managers and other stakeholders to the Convention.

With a specific focus on Nordic-Baltic Europe and on the basis of various background documents, meeting reports, and interviews with relevant WH stakeholders in the sub-region, as well as in the framework of the above-described processes, the desk study focuses on specific capacity-building needs for World Heritage in Nordic-Baltic Europe. This desk study will also serve as a background document for the WHC/EUR Unit, Focal Points at national level and other stakeholders during the preparation of a strategy/programme for the sub-region. The PR data reveal that very few of the States Parties in the sub-region have developed and are implementing national capacity-building strategies.

The 8 States Parties analysed and included in this desk study are: Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden. These States Parties have 39 sites inscribed on the World Heritage List, including transnational sites (which are counted as one site only, although Struve expands through eight State Parties in total, the High Coast/Kvarken Archipelago is shared between Sweden and Finland, the Curonian Spit between Lithuania and Russia, and Wadden Sea between Netherlands, Germany and Denmark). The diversity of sites, categories and circumstances for the region have also been considered, and the report refers to different sources, including capacity-building needs identified at different meetings during the preparation and implementation of the Second Cycle of the PR for the Nordic-Baltic sub-region.



The meetings include:

- Periodic Reporting meeting for Nordic-Baltic Focal Points, Stockholm, Sweden, 9 December, 2009.
- Workshop for Nordic-Baltic Focal Points, Tallinn, Estonia, 4-6 October 2010.
- Workshop/Meeting of National Focal Points of Western and Nordic-Baltic European Countries on the Preparation of the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting Exercise on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, Reykjavik, Iceland, 18-21 October 2011.
- National Capacity-Building Meetings (total 12 meetings) for Site Managers and Focal Points in the Nordic-Baltic Sub-Region, 2010-2013.
- Periodic Reporting meeting for Western, Nordic-Baltic and Mediterranean Europe, Berlin, Germany, 24-26 September 2012.
- 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 Pehn, Cambodia, 21 June 2013.
- Mid-cycle Review Meeting for National Focal Point of the Europe and North America Region, UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, France, 22 November 2013.

Further, the SOC reports presented to the World Heritage Committee every year are another important source. The SOC reports provide an overview of the situation and challenges at different sites in the sub-region, and help to properly identify shared issues and challenges in the region to establish priorities towards addressing the identified needs.

Three new sites have been nominated since 2006, and the nomination documents for Surtsey (Iceland), The Decorated Farmhouses of Hälsingland (Sweden) and Stevns Klint (Denmark) have all been taken into consideration for this desk study. Further, three existing sites have been extended in the period analysed here, namely the Kvarken Archipelago/High Coast (Sweden & Finland), the Røros Mining Town and the Circumference (Norway) and finally the Wadden Sea (Denmark, Netherland and Germany). The corresponding documents and recommendations in the inscription decisions have also been reviewed.

The Statistical Analysis of the State of Conservation of World Heritage Properties looks at factors reported to the World Heritage Committee from 1979 to 2013 that have a negative impact on World Heritage Properties, and information from this is compared with the other sources used for the desk study for the Nordic-Baltic sub-region. Further, the recently launched IUCN World Heritage Outlook (<http://www.worldheritageoutlook.iucn.org>), has been reviewed. This web-based tool provides a global assessment of the conservation prospects for natural World Heritage and identifies actions needed to support sites that are facing threats.

It is finally useful to consider the results from the First Cycle PR exercise for the Nordic-Baltic sub-region, where the following strengths and needs were identified:

#### Strengths

- Sound national legal systems for the protection and conservation of cultural and natural heritage;
- Inventories on cultural and natural heritage compiled through regional and national cooperation and used as a basis for Tentative Lists;
- Long-term cooperation on Tentative List harmonization in the Nordic countries;
- Properties in Nordic countries being nominated from underrepresented categories;
- Active role and involvement of NGO's and civil society in heritage conservation;
- Nordic World Heritage Foundation as an example of international cooperation and contribution to the implementation of the Convention.

### Weaknesses

- Tentative Lists in the Baltic countries have not been revised, and consideration to Tentative List harmonization has not been implemented;
- General lack of funding, especially in the Baltic countries;
- Need for capacity-building at different levels for an improved management of World Heritage;
- Involvement of local communities to be improved at the site level;
- Better coordination of the media for the promotion of World Heritage;
- Lack of coordination and communication between the different levels of authorities in the Baltic countries;
- NGO's position in the Baltic countries remains to be strengthened.

It is important to emphasise that certain weaknesses are still very much valid for the sub-region, in particular in relation to capacity-building needs for improved management, local community involvement as well as lack of coordination and communication between different levels of authorities. The latter issue is now an increasing challenge also in the Nordic countries.

### Capacity-Building

Since the World Heritage Convention was adopted in 1972, education and training has been crucial for the implementation of the convention at national and local levels. These concepts have evolved into deeper and broader perspectives, such as capacity-building, which today is perceived as one of the key elements concerning the sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties.

Many experts in the field, such as ICCROM, IUCN, ICOMOS, universities and others, promote activities on capacity-building, and promote a need to shift our emphasis from "knowledge transfer" to "knowledge acquisition". The adoption of the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy in 2011 reinforced this perspective. In recent years new priority topics have emerged in SOC reports and missions, and a new, more holistic approach have been perceived as key to address needs and challenges.

According to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), capacity can be conceived as "the ability of individuals, organizations and societies to perform functions, solve problems, set and achieve objectives in a sustainable manner"<sup>1</sup>. If we focus on "capacity development", the definition would be "the process through which individuals, organizations and societies obtain strength and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development objectives over time"<sup>2</sup>.

The focus must be on building capacities rather than training of individuals. It is important to identify existing expertise and capacities, highlight good practice examples, and ensure that future strategies indeed contribute to strengthened institutions and systematic conservation, protection and management regimes.

According to ICCROM, capacity-building for the effective management of World Heritage sites needs to:

- Strengthen the knowledge, abilities, skills and behaviour of people with direct responsibilities for heritage conservation and management;
- Improve institutional structures and processes through empowering decision-makers and policy-makers;

---

<sup>1</sup> UNDP Capacity Development Practice Note, April 2006.

<sup>2</sup> UNDP Capacity Development Practice Note, October 2008.

- And introduce a more dynamic relationship between heritage and its context by a more inclusive approach.

Thus there are many audiences that must be included in our capacity-building:

- Practitioners: those with direct responsibilities for heritage.
- Institutions: decision and policy makers.
- Communities & networks: all those who have a legitimate interest in heritage.

### 3. TRENDS: CHALLENGES AND ISSUES IN THE NORDIC-BALTIC SUB-REGION 2006-2014

The questionnaires from the Second Cycle of PR in Europe, submitted 2013-2014, form the main source of information for this study. A second important source is the 20 SOC reports from the Nordic-Baltic sub-region presented to the World Heritage Committee in the period 2006-2013, out of which 18 were opened for discussion.<sup>3</sup> Four sites have been inscribed on the World Heritage List and two sites have been extended during the period 2006-2014, and the recommendations included in the Committee decisions upon inscription are taken into consideration for the purpose of this report. Information from five reports on Advisory or Reactive Monitoring Missions is also included. Further, outcomes and recommendations from various meetings and certain issues NWHF have been involved in during the period are taken into consideration. Finally, data from the Statistical Analysis of SOC reports in Europe and North America from 1979 to 2013, and the IUCN World Heritage Outlook for natural WH have also been reviewed for the purpose of comparing trends for this desk study.

Based on our analyses, we can identify certain priority areas in the Nordic-Baltic sub-region:

#### 1. Management Systems / Management Plans

World Heritage sites have particular management requirements, as their management objectives must be established in relation to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. The Committee highlights that there is a need to clarify the relation between sites' management systems and the protection of OUV. The clarification of the WH values in the retrospective Statements of OUV, including the sites' authenticity and integrity, represent a step to better identify the needs and challenges. Yet, issues related to management systems, plans and activities are referred to in 15 of the 20 SOC reports analysed, and a recurrent topic in the PR questionnaires. Further, it becomes clear that regular evaluation and follow-up could contribute towards more sustainable management systems.

The **development and implementation of Management Systems/Plans** is a continuous request in the Committee's decisions. The ideal objective is an overall, comprehensive, integrated and multi-disciplinary management plan, and for some cases it is requested that the plan covers both natural and cultural values, since a holistic approach to site management is considered more sustainable.

In some cases appropriate management plans exist, yet **implementation** appears to be challenging and therefore certain issues affecting the properties are not properly addressed. Both the development and implementation of management systems/plans are in certain cases reported to be very challenging and slow, with clear consequences for conservation, protection and management.

**Lack of coordinated efforts and collaboration between various levels of national authorities** in the management is another challenge related to site management. Coordination and definition of clear roles and responsibilities for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention through agreements between the responsible national, regional and local levels is highly necessary.

For some cultural landscapes, there is the recurrent need to protect the **integrity of the landscape**. The sites should not be considered isolated monuments, but as part of a broader frame, in which the landscape is perceived the core element for protection and management of the site. In addition, some sites show the need to **face the increasing socio-economic pressure**, with a living landscape approach that recognises and promotes the knowledge of traditional land uses and management and conservation systems in the property. Land-use plans can thus be a practical tool for the management of some sites.

**Legal issues** appear as a challenge for several sites, including lack of protective measures that can secure the conservation of the site and its OUV. Some sites still report a specific **lack of tailored**

---

<sup>3</sup> See full list of Decisions on State of Conservation in Annex I of this report.

**legislation** adapted to the characteristics and particularities of the site, and in some circumstances weak enforcement mechanisms are reported.

For some sites in the Baltic countries, the Committee highlighted on the basis of SOC reports that **traditional systems of conservation and management** should also be part of future management systems, which should be considered a general issue relevant also for many of the Nordic sites.

The issues identified above further highlights a clear need for development of efficient monitoring tools, with site-specific indicators, integrated in the management systems/plans.

## 2. Balance between Development and World Heritage

Some of the major issues, which have an impact on the OUV of the WH properties in the region, are related to development pressures.<sup>4</sup> 15 of the studied SOC reports identified **infrastructure and development issues** as key factors affecting the state of conservation of the sites, and various development issues are the most frequently reported negative factors affecting the properties according to the PR. The analysis reveals a clear need to develop measures to adequately mitigate the effects of such pressures. At the same time, it is crucial to realise that a balance between conservation and development must be defined, as several sites in the sub-region include living communities (incl. city/urban sites, but also in cultural landscapes and natural sites), local livelihoods and community development, all considered highly important for the future of the sites.

Development of infrastructure represents an important aspect of such pressures. Various construction activities related to for example roads, tunnels and bridges, oil and gas infrastructure, renewable energy facilities, protective shelters, coastal infrastructure including port developments, mining and quarrying, drainage systems, waste management, walkways are all reported. Several sites also report issues with road traffic, including more specific issues like risks of inner city transport of hazardous materials.

**Inventories** are an important prerequisite for conservation and management. Unclear boundaries and buffer zones are seen to cause challenges in certain sites, which become highly visible as development pressures, as mentioned above, arise. Although the status of boundaries and buffer zones have improved since the First Cycle of PR, development pressures are increasing and several sites face serious challenges.

A number of sites face pressures from urban development, and again unclear boundaries and buffer zones may contribute to the significant threats facing the sites. For example, visual integrity is seen to be under threat from developments within buffer zones but also within the actual site boundaries, highlighting the need for **protection of the skyline configuration**, as requested by the Committee. Clear policies are necessary in order to properly protect the setting of the sites, including skylines. These measures could also help address **illegal construction**, which is referred to in various SOC reports and IUCN's World Heritage Outlook.

When dealing with World Heritage sites, development and infrastructure projects need to be subject to impact studies. Taking into consideration the abovementioned issues, it is clear that there is a need to improve capacities to prepare **Heritage Impact Assessments**, including Environmental Impact Assessments<sup>5</sup> and Strategic Environmental Assessments, as a standard tool within management systems and monitoring instruments. These studies must include a Visual Impact Assessment whenever necessary. **Climate impacts** should also be considered an important component in environmental assessments (cf. item 5 below).

---

<sup>4</sup> In some cases inappropriate developments have not been reported in due time to the World Heritage Committee through the World Heritage Centre, as requested in **paragraph 172** of the Operational Guidelines for the Convention.

<sup>5</sup>

[https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn\\_advice\\_note\\_environmental\\_assessment\\_18\\_11\\_13\\_iucn\\_template.pdf](https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn_advice_note_environmental_assessment_18_11_13_iucn_template.pdf)

As already mentioned (cf. item 1 above), the national legal frameworks and the capacity for enforcement of these sometimes seem to be inadequate for the purpose of maintaining the OUV of the sites. Further, a clarification of roles and responsibilities between various levels of government (local, regional and national) appears highly necessary, also in relation to development pressures.

Management systems and plans must reflect these issues and propose mitigating measures as well as mechanisms for dialogue amongst relevant stakeholders, and include long-term plans or strategies to balance site conservation, protection and management with development pressures, while also ensuring local livelihoods and community development (cf. item 3 below).

### **3. Stakeholder involvement, coordination and engagement**

There is a clear need to **strengthen collaboration among all stakeholders**, with a multi-disciplinary approach and development of coordination instruments for shared decision-making. Improving the coordination mechanisms is presented as a need related to the new inscriptions and extensions of WH sites, as well as in SOC reports and PR. The need to enhance coordination and coherent decision-making is important as it can ensure continuous political and financial support for the sites. Coordinated and clear management and monitoring roles and responsibilities must be identified, with a view to also secure technical and financial resources. Qualified and adequate staff and human resources must be included in this framework.

**Awareness-raising** on the scope and values of the properties among relevant stakeholders and particularly the **local communities** is important to secure local ownership and participation in conservation, protection and management of the sites. Local stakeholders must be involved and engaged and communities should benefit, but also contribute, through mutual partnerships. Such approaches would help to face the sometimes limited awareness at local level concerning the values of the site, which may pose a potential threat to its future conservation, development and sustainability.

**Education facilities and interpretation** for the sites is mentioned as another topic. The Committee has requested improved instruments for interpretation in order to adequately promote the values of the site, and several sites asks for improved facilities for education, research, interpretation and communication of the World Heritage values.

### **4. Sustainable Tourism**

Tourism development in and around World Heritage properties may pose a key issue for their management; both for its potential socio-economic benefits, but also for the possible negative impacts on the properties' state of conservation, and in the last instance their OUV. The issue is high on the World Heritage Committee's agenda, and consequently a new World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme was adopted in 2012.

In the Nordic-Baltic sub-region, both the States Parties and the sites report challenges in relation to tourism and related infrastructure, local communities and their livelihoods, visitor management, modes of mobility/transportation etc. More often than not, development projects to cater for the tourism industry are motivated by short-term economic interests conflicting the World Heritage values, thereby contributing to degradation of the sites and their values, and in the long-term also the attractiveness of World Heritage itself.

Sustainable planning and management of tourism, as an integrated part of the overall management systems/plans, is therefore a prerequisite to address these increasing challenges and ensure conservation of the World Heritage properties. The States Parties and sites in the sub-region have expressed a clear need for tools for the development of strategies to ensure that tourism is sustainable in its widest definition. At the same time ensuring that the OUV of the sites is maintained, and further that tourism contributes to local communities/livelihoods, and finally conservation. The World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme is set up to support States Parties and WH properties in identifying viable solutions adapted to local contexts and needs, where development through tourism with conservation and protection efforts can go hand in hand.

As part of the UNESCO World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme, a World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Toolkit is being developed. The Nordic-Baltic project *Towards a Nordic-Baltic pilot region for World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism*, coordinated by NWHF is a sub-regional contribution to the UNESCO Programme. Outcomes include a proposed Analytical Framework for establishing a baseline for development of sustainable World Heritage tourism strategies. It is anticipated that the project will be continued and thereby contributing to a larger capacity building effort supporting sites in implementing sustainable tourism.

## 5. Risk preparedness

Several sites and States Parties emphasise the need to undertake **risk preparedness** studies. Training workshops for risk preparedness are recognised as a necessary measure in order to improve site managers' preparedness to risk and develop more effective disaster risk management systems to prevent and mitigate potential threats to the sites' OUV.

The sites are asked to report on factors affecting the properties as part of the PR exercise. The most reported current negative risks relate to transport infrastructure and its uses, deliberate destruction of heritage, impacts of tourism/recreational/visitor activities, and pollution in various forms. Among the potential risks reported, certain factors, such as fire, flooding and storms are recognised by a majority of sites as both current and potential risks, but there is also an increasing focus on effects arising from climate change across the sub-region and typologies of sites.

Climate change is recognized as a threat for the conservation of biological diversity (fauna and flora) and for the promotion and maintenance of pastoral and agricultural traditional practices. Both indirect and direct impacts of climate change are reported, and nearly all sites report potential negative impacts from climate change. The effects of already on-going changes are reported, in particular in cultural landscapes and natural sites, seen for example in the Curonian Spit (Lithuania/Russia), suffering from intense erosion due to destructive impacts of extremely powerful storms and hurricanes. Several cultural sites report increased impacts of rain, humidity, microorganisms, temperature, and the natural sites frequently report erosion, pollution and heavy storms.

There is also a high number of sites reporting current and potential negative impacts from factors concerning social/cultural uses of heritage, such as "Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and local community"; "Society's valuing of heritage"; "Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge systems", "Impacts of tourism/visitors/recreation" and "Deliberate destruction of heritage".<sup>6</sup> Such risks may be perceived as more "intangible" factors, but nonetheless indicate the strong relevance of emphasising sustainable tourism management, local community involvement and livelihoods, inclusive stakeholder approaches, strengthened efforts towards awareness raising and improved education of relevant actors.

Further conservation issues, such as identification of buildings at risk, avoiding demolition of historic structures, conservation of traditional buildings (such as timber houses), collapsing buildings and conservation issues related to ruined monuments are also found in the reports.

In sum, the issues identified above show that a broad approach to risk preparedness is necessary, and risk preparedness will have to include more than "tangible" risk factors. Further, the fact that several issues are interlinked indicate that a more holistic approach towards development of management systems/plans, which also include risk preparedness, tourism management, stakeholder and community involvement etc., may be a central goal for future capacity building efforts.

---

<sup>6</sup> From the Second Cycle of PR in Europe questionnaire.

#### 4. MAIN PRIORITIES, ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE WAY FORWARD FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING FOR WORLD HERITAGE IN THE NORDIC-BALTIC SUB-REGION

Capacity building is key to sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties, and the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy is an obvious starting point. Identifying the main threats and issues affecting the properties in the sub-region, by analysis of PR, SOC-reports, meetings and consultations, highlights the key issues that needs focus in the following years to support States Parties and stakeholders to improve the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Nordic-Baltic sub-region. These preliminary results would need to be considered and reviewed in light of the final results of the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting and also through consultations with States Parties and relevant stakeholders in the sub-region. The PR meeting in Helsinki 1-2 December 2014 will present results and recommendations for the Second Cycle PR in Europe and provide important inputs towards capacity building and World Heritage in Europe and the sub-regions. The sub-region should aim to map its existing capacities and resources towards addressing the main needs identified in this report and further collaborate on developing a future capacity-building programme.

The World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy and the goals and actions identified therein will form the foundation for a sub-regional strategy to enhance conservation, protection and management, and the overall implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the States Parties. Based on the analysis above, the following overall goals in the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy must be considered in detail in the future development of action plans and capacity building programmes concerning the Nordic-Baltic sub-region:

Goal	
<b>Credibility</b>	1. The Convention is understood and achieves overall positive benefit to conservation while avoiding negative impacts.
<b>Conservation</b>	3. National Institutions are effective in the identification, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage.
	4. Effective sustainable management and conservation of WH occurs, taking into account the dynamics of specific local contexts and settings within the larger framework of global WH processes.
	5. Skills for conservation of cultural and natural heritage are strengthened.
	6. The availability of funding and other resources to meet conservation needs in World Heritage Sites is significantly enhanced.
<b>Community</b>	7. Greater mutual benefits to communities and their heritage results through sustainable development associated with World Heritage Properties.
	8. Greater and inclusive participation of local communities in heritage conservation, presentation and associated development.
<b>Communication</b>	9. Increased awareness of the need for and benefits from heritage conservation and the contribution of the World Heritage Convention to achieving this.



## ANNEX I

### DECISIONS FROM THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE CONSIDERED FOR THE DESK STUDY AND CORRESPONDING DOCUMENTS (SOCs AND NOMINATION FILES)

#### **Denmark**

##### ***Ilulissat Icefjord***

*Decision 31COM 7B.28 (2007 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2007/whc07-31com-24e.pdf>

*Decision 32COM 7B.23 (2009 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2009/whc09-33com-7Be.pdf>

##### ***Stevns Klint***

*Decision 38COM 8B.10 & Nominaton file (2014)*

<http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1416.pdf>

##### ***Wadden Sea***

*Decision 38COM 8B.13 (2014)*

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/6098>

##### ***Jelling Mounds, Runic Stones and Church***

*Decision 34COM 7B.98 (2009 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2009/whc09-33com-20e.pdf>

#### **Estonia**

##### ***Historic Centre of Tallinn***

*Decision 31COM 7B.95 (2007 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2007/whc07-31com-24e.pdf>

*Decision 32COM 7B.87 (2008 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008/whc08-32com-24reve.pdf>

*Decision 33COM 7B.99 (2009 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2009/whc09-33com-20e.pdf>

*Decision 35COM 7B.90 (2011 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2011/whc11-35com-20e.pdf>

#### **Iceland**

##### ***Surtsey***

*Decision 32COM 8B.11 (2008 – Nomination)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008/whc08-32com-24reve.pdf>

#### **Lithuania**

##### ***Curonian Spit***

*Decision 31COM 7B.114 (2007 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2007/whc07-31com-24e.pdf>

*Decision 32COM 7B.98 (2008 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008/whc08-32com-24reve.pdf>

*Decision 34COM 7B.91 (2010 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2010/whc10-34com-20e.pdf>

*Decision 35COM 7B.99 (2011 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2011/whc11-35com-20e.pdf>

*Decision 36COM 7B.78 (2012 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2012/whc12-36com-19e.pdf>

**Vilnius Historic Centre**

*Decision 32COM 7B.99 (2008 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008/whc08-32com-24reve.pdf>

*Decision 33COM 7B.112 (2009 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2009/whc09-33com-20e.pdf>

*Decision 35COM 7B.98 (2011 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2011/whc11-35com-20e.pdf>

*Decision 37COM 7B.103 (2013 – SOC)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2013/whc13-37com-20-en.pdf>

**Sweden**

**Farms and Villages in Hälsingland**

*Decision 36COM 8B.28 (2009 – Nomination)*

And its related report on the state of conservation, which can be found at:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2009/whc09-33com-20e.pdf>

## ANNEX II

TABLE: SOC REPORTS WITH THREATS

SOC Reports (2006 - 2014)	Year	Country	Threats
Jelling Mounds, Runic Stones & Church	2009	Denmark	Temperature, Water, Wind
Ilulissat Icefjord	2007	Denmark	Effects from transportation infrastructure, fishing/collecting aquatic resources, impact of tourism, management systems/plans, solid waste, subsistence hunting.
Ilulissat Icefjord	2009	Denmark	Effects from transportation infrastructure, fishing/collecting aquatic resources, impact of tourism, subsistence hunting, temperature change
Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn	2006	Estonia	Effects from transportation infrastructure, major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure.
Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn	2007	Estonia	Effects from transportation infrastructure, housing, major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure, management systems/plans
Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn	2008	Estonia	Impact: transportation of hazardous materials, effects from transportation infrastructure, housing, visitor accommodation/associated infrastructure, mngt systems/plans.
Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn	2009	Estonia	Impact: transportation of hazardous materials, effects from transportation infrastructure, housing, visitor accommodation/associated infrastructure, mngt systems/plans.
Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn	2011	Estonia	Impact: transportation of hazardous material, housing, major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure, mngt systems/plans.
Historic Centre of Riga	2007	Latvia	Housing, legal framework
Historic Centre of Riga	2008	Latvia	Housing, legal framework
Historic Centre of Riga	2009	Latvia	Housing, legal framework
Curonian Spit	2006	Lithuania	Management Systems/plan, pollution of marine waters
Curonian Spit	2007	Lithuania	Management Systems/plan, surface water pollution
Curonian Spit	2008	Lithuania	Management Systems/plan, oil and gas, solid waste, surface water pollution
Curonian Spit	2010	Lithuania	Housing, illegal activities, management systems/plan, oil and gas, solid waste, surface water pollution
Curonian Spit	2011	Lithuania	Erosion and siltation/deposition, housing, impacts of tourism/visitor/recreation, management systems/plan, oil and gas, solid waste, surface water pollution.
Curonian Spit	2012	Lithuania	Erosion and siltation/deposition, housing, impacts of tourism/visitor/recreation, management systems/plan, oil and gas, solid waste, surface water pollution.
Curonian Spit	2014	Lithuania	Erosion and siltation/deposition, ground transport infrastructure, oil and gas
Vilnius Historic Centre	2006	Lithuania	Deliberate destruction of heritage, housing
Vilnius Historic Centre	2008	Lithuania	Deliberate destruction of heritage, housing, management systems/plan
Vilnius Historic Centre	2009	Lithuania	Housing, legal framework, management systems/plan
Vilnius Historic Centre	2011	Lithuania	Housing, legal framework, management systems/plan
Vilnius Historic Centre	2013	Lithuania	Housing
No SOC reports for Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden on this time period.			

## ANNEX III

### BIBLIOGRAPHY AND RELATED DOCUMENTS

ICOMOS, *Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage properties*, Paris, 2011.

IUCN World Heritage Advice Note: *Environmental Assessment & World Heritage*, 2013.

IUCN World Heritage Outlook, a global assessment, [Worldheritageoutlook.iucn.org](http://Worldheritageoutlook.iucn.org)

*Managing Natural World Heritage*, UNESCO/ICCROM/ICOMOS/IUCN, Paris, 2012.

*Managing Cultural World Heritage*, UNESCO/ICCROM/ICOMOS/IUCN, Paris, 2013.

State of Conservation of World Heritage Properties, *A Statistical Analysis 1979-2013*

UNDP, *Capacity Development Practice*, April 2006.

UNDP, *Capacity Development Practice*, October 2008.

UNESCO, *Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, 1972.

UNESCO, *Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, 2013.

Rapports du patrimoine mondial, n° 20 : *Rapport périodique et plan d'action. Europe 2005-2006*, UNESCO, 2007.

World Heritage Papers, n° 10: *Monitoring World Heritage*, UNESCO, 2004.

#### *Documents :*

- Report on the Mid-cycle Review Meeting for National Focal Points of the Europe and North America Region, 22 November 2013, Paris.
- Report on the Meeting of the Mediterranean European Focal Point for World Heritage, 16-19 September 2013, Florence (Italy).
- Summary of the side-event on the capacity-building strategy initiative for Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe region, 37th session of the World Heritage Committee, Cambodia, 19 June 2013.
- Blueprint. Capacity-Building strategy for Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe, UNESCO (WHC), 2012.
- Periodic Reporting Handbook for Site Managers, UNESCO.
- World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy (Decision 35COM/9B)