

Periodic Reporting Follow-up Meeting for the Mediterranean and South-eastern Europe subregions

**17 -19 April 2008
Corfu, Greece**

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The participants of the Follow-up Meeting to Periodic Reporting the Mediterranean and South-eastern Europe subregions, which took place from 17 -19 April 2008 appreciated the efforts by the Greek authorities, in particular the Hellenic Ministry for Culture, the General Directorate of Antiquities and Cultural Heritage, Directorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities, for hosting this important event for the region. They expressed their gratitude to the City of Corfu, the Technical Chamber of Corfu and the Museum for Asian Art of Corfu of the Hellenistic Ministry of Culture for the warm welcome.

The meeting was attended by 43 participants from 15 countries (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Israel, Italy, Malta, Montenegro, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, and Turkey), as well as by Representatives of IUCN (IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation), ICOMOS, ICCROM and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and the Chairperson of the European Periodic Reporting exercise. The list of participants and agenda of the meeting are enclosed as Annex I and II.

CONCLUSIONS

The participants recalled the success of the Periodic Reporting for the European Region presented to the World Heritage Committee in 2006 for 5 sub-regions covering 48 countries and a total of 244 sites (including transboundary properties). They considered that the process became an important tool for cooperation, exchange and joint action to enhance heritage conservation in general.

The participants noted that the World Heritage List celebrated its 30th anniversary in 2008 and that many sites from Europe and particularly in the Mediterranean region were inscribed at a very early stage. Concepts such as management plans, buffer zones or integrity evolved with the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and were refined over time.

The participants reviewed the results of the Periodic Reporting and focused follow up presented by the Advisory Bodies and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and highlighted the situation in the respective countries in their status reports in line with the 5 “C”s (conservation, credibility, communication, capacity building and communities), in particular regarding updated legislation, name changes, revisions to Tentative Lists (to include

underrepresented themes and also reduce existing lists and develop appropriate methodologies and frameworks), (transnational, serial and transcontinental) nomination projects, boundary revisions and buffer zone preparations, updating and adoption of management or other plans (urban plans, master plans, spatial plans etc.) and trends in conservation and effective monitoring (issues of ownership and stakeholder consultations), restoration/rehabilitation/intervention projects, management systems, risk preparedness and specific – such as fire, theft - protection systems etc.). Visibility of World Heritage and public awareness was enhanced through interpretation and various promotion materials, publications and electronic dissemination and also increased among civil society and NGOs in particular in SEE. Additional funding sources are required for World Heritage activities, access to EU funding to be increased and new and enhanced partnerships are encouraged (e.g. heritage routes, cultural tourism, as well as with other Conventions). Information was also provided on training courses, university programmes and capacity building as well as national networks of site managers and organizations in charge of World Heritage (e.g. national World Heritage Committees, Commission or offices).

In depth discussions were held on the situation with processes related to management planning and consultation and a number of issues were discussed including involvement of local people and stakeholders including investors, planning processes and updating of management plans, coordination with different bodies and management of complex sites such as historic cities, cultural landscapes and large scale sites with different municipalities.

Specific working groups were held for the following themes for which the summaries are included in Annex III to assist in reflections for revisions of Tentative Lists:

- Historic urban landscapes
- Archaeological sites
- Cultural landscapes
- Industrial heritage
- Cultural routes, Routes of Healing, Olive and Wine Routes, Water Routes
- Greco-Roman Theatres and Amphitheatres
- Fortifications
- Phoenician, Greek and Roman sites.

In view of these considerations, follow-up actions taken so far and animated discussions in plenary and working groups, a number of recommendations from the meeting should be taken into account. These are addressed to States Parties to the Convention, the Advisory Bodies ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN as well as the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and the World Heritage Committee:

RECOMMENDATIONS

Updates of national legislation

The participants noted that a number of **national legislations** concerning heritage have been revised, updated or are under revision, and that States Parties are encouraged to

provide copies to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre; cooperation between national agencies dealing with natural and cultural heritage is encouraged;

Statements of significance/statement of outstanding universal value

The participants urged ICCROM to disseminate the information on the workshop on the **Statements on Outstanding Universal Value**, and noted that the concept is not fully understood at the national and local levels. Further time and advice is required to prepare proper statements in accordance with the Operational Guidelines.

Boundaries and buffer zones

The participants reviewed progress made with many **boundary clarifications** provided by 1 December 2007, which are being presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, July 2008).

The participants noted that further work is required on major boundary modifications and the **establishment of buffer zones** for the properties which do not have any. The recommendations of the workshop on World Heritage and Buffer zones (Davos, March 2008) should be taken into account, in particular as many buffer zones are not covered by the management plans for the World Heritage property;

Management plans and management systems

The participants consider that management plans are useful **tools in heritage conservation** and should be based on clear statements of outstanding universal value for World Heritage.

The participants welcomed that a number of **management plans** have been prepared and were submitted in draft form (2 copies, also electronically) to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS, ICCROM);

They however note that further work is required and welcome the preparation of the **Resource Manuals** on management planning. The participants encourage the Advisory Bodies to advance in this project as specific advice is required for best practice models.

The participants emphasize that **stakeholder consultation** and involvement throughout the process of planning and preparation of management plans and documentation of systems is crucial. The participants acknowledge that these processes take considerable time.

Concerning **risk management and risk preparedness**, the participants welcome a conference to be hosted by the Greek authorities in September 2008.

Tentative Lists

The participants, through thematic workshops, discussed a number of heritage **themes relevant for the Mediterranean region** and considered that these themes provide a basis for cooperation among the countries and to explore linking existing sites and revising Tentative Lists to include transnational serial sites. They encourage States Parties to offer

hosting focused thematic meetings and suggest establishing working groups on specific topics (e.g. by ICOMOS on classical civilizations in the Mediterranean).

The participants encourage in-depth **comparative analysis** on these topics both at the national level and through comparative studies (regional, global) by ICOMOS and IUCN.

The participants noted that progress had been made with **updating existing Tentative Lists** and encourage all States Parties to use best practice methodologies and frameworks for a thorough selection of potential sites.

The participants welcomed the public access to all Tentative Lists at whc.unesco.org; they considered, however, that **direct exchange and consultations** among States Parties and focal points is the best way to work towards harmonization of Tentative Lists for certain themes in line with the Global Strategy.

Sustainable Use of properties

The participants considered that the authenticity and integrity of use and functions of World Heritage properties and parts of sites need to be taken into account in any **re-development and re-use** of monuments, buildings and landscapes.

Presentation, Promotion and communication of World Heritage

The participants noted the efforts undertaken at national levels concerning publication and dissemination of World Heritage information and encourage further efforts specifically for transnational serial projects;

Sustainable Tourism

The participants note that a meeting on cultural corridors, routes and cultural tourism is scheduled 12-13 June 2008 in Athens for South Eastern Europe;

The participants encourage that sustainable tourism be included in the management plans for World Heritage properties;

Other issues

Concerning the reliable **database** of European site managers (Decision 31 COM 11A.1), the participants urge the States Parties concerned as soon as possible to provide and to update as necessary the details (name, function, address, telephone, fax, e-mail, web-page) to the World Heritage Centre;

2nd Session Statements of Outstanding Universal Value.

Workshops Case study No 1

HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPES

HOLY SEE – ITALY – MALTA – ISRAEL – ROMANIA – SAN MARINO

Facilitator : J. Jokilehto, ICOMOS *International Expert*

WORKSHOP ON HISTORIC URBAN LANDSCAPES =HUL / Corfu, 18 April 2008

Facilitated by Jukka Jokilehto

Members: Italy, Israel, Malta, Romania, Greece, and Fejérdy

The working group discussed the proposed theme in an informal manner, and noted first of all that the issue was completely new with no officially recognized examples so far. Historic Urban Landscape, HUL, is a new concept, which resulted from the reaction to the introduction of tall new buildings in historically established context, such as Vienna. The mayor of Vienna invite an international conference to deliberate on the theme, introducing the by now well-known Vienna Memorandum. There are various consequences from this memorandum. One is that UNESCO has decided to revise the 1976 International Recommendation concerning Historic Areas in order to introduce the concept of HUL.

As a rule, the World Heritage Convention recognizes three categories for cultural properties: monuments, groups of buildings, and sites. Normally, historic urban areas are defined as “groups of buildings”, while cultural landscapes are defined as “sites”. The difference would be that in case of groups of buildings the emphasis would be on the built structures, while in the case of sites, one could pay attention to traditional life and functions that characterize the area.

The issue of HUL has been discussed by a working group invited by UNESCO, which has so far met in Paris, Jerusalem, St Petersburg and Olinda (in variable composition). The reports of these meetings are gradually building up material for the revision of the recommendation as noted above. It will take about two more years to produce a draft text for the revised convention, which will then go to the adoption process to be finally discussed by the General Conference of UNESCO.

If the World Heritage Committee then decides to take aboard this concept, it can introduce a new section or annex into the Operational Guidelines. In fact, the working group noted that the WH Guidelines are generally stronger than any of the UNESCO Recommendations. It would be useful to take an initiative and assess the use of these texts as references in the preparation of national or local norms or other legal instruments.

It was agreed that HUL goes beyond the traditionally protected urban areas, “historic centres”, and proposes to see the overall context and its setting. Therefore, many of the recommendations that have come out so far would be particularly relevant to the areas that form the setting to protected areas. In this sense, reference can also be made to the recommendations of the 2005 ICOMOS Xi’an Declaration on setting, and attention can be drawn to the 2000 European Florence Convention concerning landscapes

We can notice that the notion of “historic” in the historic urban landscape would refer to something that has been recognized as historical and therefore bearer of value. Consequently, historic urban landscape would not be just any urban area, but an area that has consolidated qualities or characteristics that merit attention. It has also been recognized that when dealing historic areas in general, also including historic urban landscapes, these can be seen to be associated with several layers of perceptions by the different stakeholders. Such perceptions need to be taken into consideration when defining the significance of such areas.

It was noted that while the Vienna Memorandum has already been taken note of by various States Parties, it should be rather seen as document that is part of a process. The definitions and instruments still need to be given precise form and wording. It was also noted that problems can easily be caused by words that are not properly understood and interpreted. This is the case also of the Vienna Memorandum and even of other international doctrinal documents if these leave space for different interpretations without being properly understood.

In the case that the definition of HUL would concern mainly the overall urban landscape, and the setting of specifically protected areas, it could be seen as a set of new planning instruments and an invitation to take this broader context or setting into account in the decision-making process regarding changes into the existing situation. As such, HUL would aim at guaranteeing continuity, providing assurance that eventual changes or substitutions be coherent with the overall character.

It has also been recommended that the World Heritage Committee could decide to introduce HUL under the World Heritage category of “sites”, in addition to “groups of buildings”. In such cases, the entire area should obviously be suitably protected and the management should be provided by proper planning instruments and decision-making processes. An important aspect in historic urban landscapes would be the multiple dimension of identity and other associated intangible aspects. At the same time, considering that change is part of life and part of the functioning of living urban areas, it is necessary that all stakeholders be properly involved in the management processes.

We should not consider the recognition of heritage value of a certain area, be it HUL, as something opposed to development. Rather, we should see that heritage is a living part of human life and experience. Conserving urban heritage should be seen as a part of development, and an alternative for demolition and inconsiderate substitution. The attention in the development of new instruments for the management of HUL should be both on what happens within the urban fabric itself as well as in its relationship with the setting. So the question is about inside and outside.

Heritage quality could be considered as an added value and as an encouragement for the improvement of the quality of life. Any substitution should be considered an exception. If these are necessary, care should be taken to retain the overall character and spatial qualities

of the landscape. Historic urban landscape would generally extend to a territory that goes beyond the eventual World Heritage areas and their buffer zones. In reality, we are then principally considering urban development that has taken place from the late 19th century and through the 20th century, a worldwide phenomenon.

A particular problem occurs in the outskirts of historic urban areas, which are often locations for the construction of industrially built boxes for commercial and/or industrial purposes. Such malls that develop outside city centres tend to empty the traditional historic centre areas provoking serious problems for their maintenance and rehabilitation. This is not just a problem for heritage but also for the proper social functioning of the community, especially considering the aged population, who will have difficulty in reaching the external boxes and malls. HUL results of continuing processes – fast-growing entities. The question can be raised if it is possible to control such larger areas, and what sort of planning instruments or norms would be needed to control the behaviour of large urban entities within their settings.

It was also noted that values and perceptions tend to change over time. As a result, also World Heritage properties are sometimes subject to redefinition, new boundaries, new justifications, and even changes of names. As a result, it is not excluded that, in case the World Heritage Committee decides to adopt the notion of HUL, historic urban areas that are already inscribed on the UNESCO would be redefined as historic urban landscapes.

2nd Session Statements of Outstanding Universal Value.

Workshops Case study No 2

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

ALBANIA – BULGARIA – CYPRUS – GREECE – TURKEY

Facilitator: E. Korka, *Head of the Directorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities and Focal, Point of Greece*

- The notions of authenticity and integrity are cardinal to the notion of Outstanding Universal Value.
- The revision of the Outstanding Universal Value of Tentative Lists emerges as a priority.
- Outstanding Universal Value is intrinsically related to the notion of monuments inside archaeological sites and historic centers.
- Which is the notion of Integrity of environmental sites?
- There is need for guidance and clarifications from the part of IUCN and WHC experts. Moreover, advising experts in the process of reducing entries in Tentative Lists could help in the reduction of interior pressure.
- There is no Charter equivalent to the Charter of Venice in the case of historic centers.
- The Nara Document on Authenticity needs to be reexamined and updated.
- We need to raise public awareness on the matter of protecting and promoting cultural heritage – we particularly need to turn towards the younger age groups.
- There is need for interdisciplinary cooperation in the matter of cultural heritage protection and promotion.
- Proper models regarding authenticity and Outstanding Universal Value need to be developed thematically.
- We will greatly benefit from comparative studies of the issue of archaeological sites.

- What do we consider as a site, and even more so, an archaeological site? This terminology, as well as the terminology underlying the notions of Outstanding Universal Value, its integrity and authenticity needs to be clarified.
- There is a particular difficulty for managing monuments used today – are they considered as sites?

2nd Session Statements of Outstanding Universal Value.

Workshops Case study No 3

CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

ANDORRA – BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA – CROATIA – FYROM – PORTUGAL – SERBIA

Facilitator: M. Rössler, *Head of Europe & N. America Section, World Heritage Centre*

Participants: (Portugal, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Greece, ICCROM, UNESCO)

National law and legislation

only recently included cultural landscapes (Croatia in 1997)

Nature conservation: protected landscapes but not of Outstanding Universal Value (some could be but awareness need to be raised)

Expertise

Lack of expertise for Cultural landscapes

what needs to be preserved in a landscape?

Expertise in identifying potential sites required

Many landscapes destroyed and traditional lifestyle changed due to rapid socio economic transformation: what to preserve? (links to intangible heritage – and food production);

Dinaric Arc Karst – links between cultural and biological diversity;

Coordination

Coordination among institutions and ministries in particular between Ministry for Environment and Ministry for Culture (e.g. Portugal, for the three Cultural landscapes)

Cooperation: European Landscape Convention (2000): difficulties to establish a landscape group (Croatia)

Lack of body for natural heritage (Bosnia and Herzegovina)

Tentative Lists

National registers: only a few sites are considered as cultural landscapes, mainly cultivated landscapes; therefore very few selected into Tentative List; mixed sites could be better considered as cultural landscapes (e.g. Bosnia and Herzegovina)

Application for tentative lists should be more demanding (format)

Top down and bottom up approach for preparation – States Parties could request submissions for underrepresented themes (proactive approach for cultural landscapes)

Workshop approach was very useful for harmonization of Tentative Lists

Nominations

Comparative studies can help to identify crucial areas and uniqueness (and assist in addressing local pressures)

Preparation of nomination files: interdisciplinary teams

Underrepresented themes such as agropastoralism and transhumance processes (e.g. seminar on Agropastoralism in the Mediterranean, Cevennes September 2007)

Management

Institutions would need to be established

In many cases cultural landscapes management by the local communities (stone walls to be maintained);

Issues of Ministry of agriculture

Changes of vineyards into olive culture; modernisation of vine industry, impact of EU regulations

2nd Session Statements of Outstanding Universal Value.

Workshops Case study No 4

INDUSTRIAL HERITAGE

FRANCE – SLOVENIA – SPAIN – MONTENEGRO – MONACO

Facilitator: M. Astralaga, *Director of IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation*

The Group composed by France, Montenegro, Slovenia & Spain considered that in general all criteria for the assessment of outstanding value could apply to industrial heritage depending on the type industry.

Application of criteria 1 to 5 seems to be relatively easy as in the case of sat pans, sugar mills, iron factories in Cornwall and the mercury proposal.

Applying the natural heritage criteria would a be a bit more difficult but in some cases they will be applicable, as for example intangible elements generated by the industrial activity or outstanding beauty.

Authenticity

What is the real heritage value? If it is rare and probably one of the few of the type of industry left in traditional production – i.e. sugar mills

Can we consider it is authentic if it is rebuilt rebuilt?

Integrity

Do we need to industry to work or just to be able to show how it worked? 88b complete representation of the features and processes

Tentative list

Intercontinental Mercury Camino Real proposal by Slovenia, Spain, Mexico & Peru

3 sites in France: extension of Saline d’Arc et Senans, Arsenal de Rochefort

**4th Session Transnational World Heritage Nominations –
Tentative List Harmonization.**

**Workshops
Case study No 1**

**CULTURAL ROUTES: ROUTES OF HEALING, OLIVE AND
WINE ROUTES, WATER ROUTES**

GREECE – PORTUGAL – SLOVENIA – TURKEY – ANDORRA

Facilitator : E. Korka, *Head of the Directorate of Prehistoric and
Classical Antiquities and Focal Point of Greece*

- We could benefit from guidelines from the World Heritage Center, for further definition of Cultural Routes.
- It would be useful to make a concrete proposal and harmonization of Tentative Lists, in the concept of Cultural Routes
- This discussion could be an occasion of the revision of the concept of tangible and intangible Cultural Heritage
- Underwater archaeological finds such as shipwrecks, with their cargo of amphorae, could formulate part of the trade routes of olive or wine.
- Cultural Routes highly promote the idea of communication, interchange and exchange, not only of products but also of techniques, tools, instruments, used continually from Antiquity to modern times.
- Cultural Routes become an idea of importance, as they express the intriguing history of humanity in different times, through the well-documented itineraries of historical personages.

**4th Session Transnational World Heritage Nominations –
Tentative List Harmonization.**

**Workshops
Case study No 2**

GRECO-ROMAN THEATRES AND AMPHITHEATRES

ALBANIA – CYPRUS – FYROM – ITALY – FRANCE

Facilitator : K. Lisitzin, ICCROM Associate Expert

Participants; Albania, Cyprus, France , Italy,

A global / Mediterranean context

France has recent experiences from transnational nominations and Italy from serial nominations. This is not only an administrative issue; it is a new approach requiring a new focus stepping out from the national prejudices. What do we want – what is the significance on the global level.

Nomination process

The question was raised how to advance practically with transnational/serial nominations. A more permanent and regular network with focal points must be established. Several initiatives are being taken currently. The experiences show that it is important to start with a serious scientific study before the political and administrative commitments are made. You must have a clear idea about the Statement of Significance. One coordinator is important, the documents must be compiled by one; it takes a long time, there are language obstacles etc . For example, the French Corbusier nomination has taken about six years. In this process the local administrators mandate has changed - which could also be an incentive.

Representation of the Mediterranean Classical civilization

The group moved to a broader question about the best representation of the Classical Mediterranean Civilization. There are existing nomination work. Most amphitheatres are within living cities, and/or existing WH sites. Suggestion was to look at, for example The Great Roman engineering works and public works, a specific cultural landscape – a serial nomination of a specific typology.

Way forward

A theme of reflection in a common seminar based on the existing tentative lists.

A specific working group within WH / ICOMOS

**4th Session Transnational World Heritage Nominations –
Tentative List Harmonization.**

**Workshops
Case study No 3**

FORTIFICATIONS

CROATIA – HOLY SEE – MONACO – MONTENEGRO – ROMANIA – SERBIA – SAN MARINO

**Facilitator : M. Rössler, *Head of Europe & N. America Section,
World Heritage Centre***

Facilitated by Tamás Fejérdy

Members: Croatia, Greece, Montenegro, Romania, and dr. Rössler

The main aim of this discussion was to facilitate the harmonization of TLs concerning this kind of heritage.

After discussion the following items have been identified.

Representivity issues

- the presence (representation) of this kind of properties on the WH List is to be more balanced, e.g. representation of periods, schools and personalities like Vauban;
- Fortifications already inscribed – mostly from colonial period (Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, British)
- No global study – it is needed; however the analysis of the ICOMOS GAP report (thematic framework) could be a help;

Special characteristics of fortifications for identifying OUV

- they are in the majority of cases a part of a system, not just isolated monuments/ensembles
- authenticity – the original function has been lost/finished in almost any cases
- integrity issues: problems of visual integrity: with their environment (empty surrounding existed in the past have been planted by new urban/industrial developments); and with lost elements of the original systems (demolition of outside parts like ravellinos etc.);

- possible criteria: cii, ciii, civ – in special case of very large properties also cv (“military landscape”); in very rare cases ci (?)

Management and sustainable use

- Problems of shape and size have to be managed
- this kind of property supports tourism and other (natural) challenges except urban development pressure
- the key element of a sustainable use is to identify new function(s)- like exhibition, hotel etc.

Recommendation:

- the form of e serial nomination could be absolutely relevant for the networks or systems of fortifications;
- harmonization on the sub-regional context is not really enough; regional and global level are more adequate.

4th Session Transnational World Heritage Nominations – Tentative List Harmonization.

Workshops Case study No 4

PHOENICIAN, GREEK AND ROMAN SITES

BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA – BULGARIA – ISRAEL – SPAIN – MALTA

**Facilitator : S. Avgerinou-Kolonias, *Vice-President of the Hellenic Section
of ICOMOS***

The workshop was attended by representatives of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Malta, and facilitated by Mrs. Avgerinou-Kolonias.

In ancient times, the geographical area of the Mediterranean and Southeast Europe was a world dominated by exchange and movement, where everything was traded : commercial products, ideas, technologies. The thread that could guide us to perceive this world in its entity could be serial transnational nominations, connecting World Heritage Monuments from civilizations which flourished in this world of trade and transportation, like the Phoenician, the Ancient Greek and Hellenistic, and the Roman Civilization.

In this workshop we divided our discussion in two “categories” :

1. The first one includes sites which already exist in Tentative Lists such as :

- The Roman catacombs (a type of site rather underrepresented in the W.H.L). in Italy, Malta and probably elsewhere. A comparative study could help us in the definition of other sites that could be included in this thematic transnational nomination. The nomination could also be “transcontinental” containing sites from North Africa as well.
- Another proposal is the cities of Philip II such as the archaeological site of Philippi in Greece and Ancient Plovdiv in Bulgaria, a city created by Philip II and took the name Philippoupolis.
- Within this framework, a transnational nomination of Hellenistic sites, an era also underrepresented, could be the Thracian Tomb Nemrut Dağ (Turkey), Hierapolis-Pamukkale (Turkey), the natural and architectural ensemble of Stolac (Bosnia and Herzegovina), including the archaeological site of the Hellenistic town of Daorson, the Thracian Tomb with frescoes near Alexandrova Village in Bulgaria. This proposal for

serial inscriptions of Hellenistic sites could also be extended in the neighbouring areas of North Africa and Asia, and could include their inscribed sites, like Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic), as well as sites from their Tentative List, like Apamée (Syrian Arab Republic), El Fayoum (Egypt), Gadara (Modern Um Qeis or Qays) (Jordan).

- Hellenistic - Roman cities like Nikopolis ad Istrum in Bulgaria and the archaeological site of Nikopolis in Greece.

2. The second category includes proposals for transnational nominations that need more study and research, as well as comparative analysis, because some of them contain sites already included in the Tentative Lists.

Some examples are the following :

- The Phoenician colonies / sites in Malta (Tas-Silg), not yet on the Tentative List and in Italy (Mozia, already on the Tentative List).
- The cities of Alexander the Great, named by him “Alexandria” such as Alexandria in Egypt, in Afghanistan etc.
- Within the framework of the thematic “Greek World”, a proposal could comprise the transnational nomination of a metropolis and a colony, such as the metropolis Ancient Corinth and its colonies.
- Tombs of the Roman Period, for example the ancient tomb of Silistra in Bulgaria, already on the Tentative List and tombs in Greece not yet on the Tentative List.

Another issue that came up during the discussion is whether an already inscribed site could be part of a transnational nomination with a site which is not yet on a Tentative List or with a site of a Tentative List.

Finally, it was concluded that more directions and perhaps a manual for transnational nominations from UNESCO would be of great importance and help for all States Parties.

All States Parties of this workshop noted that the abovementioned sites are simply examples for the thematic “transnational nominations” and that they should be further examined before the preparation of official submissions.