

## **Extract**

### **Report on Atelier Komárom**

#### **Theme 3. UNESCO World Heritage**

*“What makes the concept of World Heritage exceptional is its universal application. World Heritage sites belong to all the peoples of the world, irrespective of the territory on which they are located.*

*The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) seeks to encourage the identification, protection and preservation of cultural and natural heritage around the world considered to be of outstanding value to humanity. This is embodied in an international treaty called the “Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage”, adopted by UNESCO in 1972.”*

There are 2 project partners in the AT FORT team, who are managed fortresses, and are inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List, yet, and there are some others, who are working on the nomination file of their sites.

The theme “UNESCO World Heritage Nomination” was also the theme of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Atelier of AT FORT, held in Fortresses of Komárom, which are WH candidate sites.

Experts, who are interested in the preparation of the nomination file were invited to present their current situation at the workshop, where there were some professional, members of ICOMOS, ICOFORT, and the UNESCO WH Committee. After the presentations, there was a discussion, where we talked about:

- the challenges of the nomination – importance of Outstanding Universal Value
- the nomination process, the changes on it in 2011
- the advantages and the disadvantages of the WH label
- practice in Suomenlinna and Vauban Fortresses

First, **dr. Tamás Fejérdy** DLA<sup>1</sup> made a presentation about the importance of defining Outstanding Universal Value, as a key feature for inscription

#### Summary of his presentation

Outstanding Universal Value means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole.

The property’s O.U.V. should be highlighted and strongly argued.

- If more State Parties are in the cooperation, it is necessary to produce a common policy for nomination. Better to make it jointly in one nomination file or separately but as „synchronised” nomination (nominated at the same time).
- One of the most challenging but indispensable features for a serial nomination is the creation of an appropriate common management structure, which is vital for inscription.

#### **Proposals** for a more successful nomination

- Set up the statement of O.U.V. should be as simple as possible: the less is actually more!
- Use good maps with outmost clear, short (!) and easy to understand indications.
- Put the accent on the good visual presentation – few people read the nomination file in details because of the overwhelming quantity and size of working documents

---

<sup>1</sup> (Dr. Fejérdy cooperated as an invited expert, he is a former vice-president of the Gyula Forster National Office for Cultural Heritage Protection and Management (HU), also a former Head of the Secretariat of the Hungarian World Heritage Commission, and former president of the UNESCO WH Committee.)



- Detailed and worldwide (!) comparative analysis to be added – uses scientific methods and format!
- Avoid at any price to annex „compromising” pictures – otherwise the worst will be presented during evaluation - both in ICOMOS and WH Committee session
- All the element of the nomination file should be clear and short, but exhaustive and understandable for those who are not really familiar with the region
- The language of the file should be as perfect as it was done by a native speaker
- The best do the same in English and French – in order to prevent translator’s mistakes!
- Pay attention to the title of the nomination – which should be convincing already in it!
- Also pay attention to the Executive Summary – if possible with one strongly convincing map and also 1-3 convincing pictures!

The summary of Dr. Fejérdy’s presentation is attached.

Prof. Dr. Jukka Jokilehto

#### Attention to the **Protection and management of WH properties**

- Protection and management of World Heritage properties should ensure that their Outstanding Universal Value, including the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity at the time of inscription, are sustained or enhanced over time.
- A regular review of the general state of conservation of properties, and thus also their Outstanding Universal Value, shall be done within a framework of monitoring processes for World Heritage properties

#### **In relation to the nomination - focus on the serial nomination’s rules.**

- Serial properties will include two or more component parts related by clearly defined links, and provided it is the series as a whole – and not necessarily the individual parts of it – which are of Outstanding Universal Value.
- Importance of component parts should reflect cultural, social or functional links over time that provide, where relevant, landscape, ecological, evolutionary or habitat connectivity.
- Each component part should contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as a whole in a substantial, scientific, readily defined and discernible way, and may include, inter alia, intangible attributes.
- The resulting Outstanding Universal Value should be easily understood and communicated.
- Consistently, and in order to avoid an excessive fragmentation of component parts, the process of nomination of the property, including the selection of the component parts, should take fully into account the overall manageability and coherence of the property
- In the case of serial properties, a management system or mechanisms for ensuring the co-ordinated management of the separate components is essential and should be documented in the nomination
- *“Effective management involves a cycle of short, medium and long-term actions to protect, conserve and present the nominated property. An integrated approach to planning and management is essential to guide the evolution of properties over time and to ensure maintenance of all aspects of their Outstanding Universal Value. This approach goes beyond the property to include any buffer zone(s), as well as the broader setting.”<sup>2</sup>*

---

- 2 Prof.dr.Jukka Jokilehto’s presentation in Komárom, 27th of February, 2013.

## Presentations/introduced examples – theme: UNESCO World Heritage Nomination

The example of the successful WH Nomination	Marieke Steenberg	Vauban Association
Sveaborg-Viaporin-Suomenlinna	Heikki Lahdenmäki	The Governing Body of Suomenlinna
Chatham Dockyard and its Defences, and the nomination process	Joanne Cable	Medway,
The idea of the WH Nomination of the NDW	Rob Zakee	New Dutch Waterline/DLG
The nomination file of the Fortress System of Komárom/Komárno – transboundary nomination	István Varga	Fort Monostor Nonprofit Ltd.
Tentative List status and World Monuments Watch - Tools for safeguarding UNESCO sites in spatial planning	Malcolm Borg	Paola, Malta

**Marieke Steenberg**, project manager of AT FORT of Vauban Network, made a presentation of the nomination process of Vauban Fortifications (inscribed to the WH List in 2008).

### Time frame of the nomination of **Vauban's fortifications serial property**

- 2005 and 2006: preparing the nomination file
- January 2006 : Tentative list (national level)
- January 2007 : France decides to present Vauban, 2007 = tricentennial
- 7 July 2008 : inscription to the World Heritage List
- The nomination file: 3000 pages, 181 maps, 500 photographs

### Key factors of the success:

- The nomination file and the scientific argumentation
- Conviction and local engagement
- Ambassadors/support at the highest level
- A broad participation of the public (local support committees)
- Decent management plans
- Appropriate communication

### Challenges, which they should facing:

- Car parking
- Urban development
- Buffer zone modifications
- Buffer zones for fortified new towns
- Conservation
- Tourism
- Redevelopment
- Urban regeneration, awareness raising

**Heikki Lahdenmäki** architect, representing the Suomenlinna/Sveaborg fortress as a nominated WH site (1991) made a presentation about their 22 years practices about the management of a WH site.

He collect their practices about the question of staff, financing, construction works on the site, and of course, about the administrative works like periodic reports, and importance of the re-evaluation of a management plan.

He stressed:

*“An appropriate management plan or other management system is essential and shall be provided in the nomination.”* and *“To provide an assessment as to whether the outstanding universal value of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List is being maintained over time.”*



**Joanne Cable, Medway**

- The nomination process of Chatham Dockyard and its Defences (ongoing nomination), focused to the possible impact of the WH nomination to the area's and the property's tourism, comparing or based on other sites practices/statistical data.
- management within the fortified elements is by volunteers.
- The overall nomination is led by the local municipality (Medway Council) and supported by cooperative associations and administrative teams of different expertise organisations. (Like Fort Amherst Heritage Trust, English Heritage, ICOMOS-UK, Chatham Historic Dockyard Trust, etc.)

**Rob Zakee, New Dutch Waterline Projectbureau**

- the WH vision of the New Dutch Waterline Defence System in the Netherlands.
- Strategy is the nomination as an "Expansion of Stelling van Amsterdam", which is already a World Heritage since 1996.
- The most important part of this ongoing nomination is the management of the nomination process and also the questions of integration of the management plan of the NDW into the Stelling van Amsterdam's management.
- The clear advantage of this nomination method is the presence of the high level representative stakeholders, the efforts to create synergy between rules and pacts of different levels (international, national, regional, local) (like Panorama Krayenhoff, Intergovernmental Treaty, Implementation Program, National Policy Paper on Cultural Heritage, National Spatial Planning, Dossier Stelling van Amsterdam, UNESCO Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, Provincial and local spatial planning plans, etc.)

**dr. Malcolm Borg** in his presentation of "WHS tentative list status and WORLD MONUMENTS WATCH – tools for conservation and spatial planning"

- possible nomination process in collaboration between local council and NGO
- This presentation is about the context of a WH Tentative List status and the monument protection and spatial planning, which can be a new dimension, new focus point in a WH nomination process.

The questions were:

- UNESCO nomination why?
- conservation?
- protection?
- labelling?
- politics?
- feel good club?
- genuine expectations?

Example about the Harbour Fortifications of Malta (inscribed to the WH List in 1996)

Lost and won

- parliament against tunnelling
- buffer areas
- area of high landscape value
- full restoration EU funding 138m
- St.Elmo EU funding 12m
- action plan areas pre-2001

- some intrusive interventions
- Gate Renzo Piano project?
- Barracca lift

The conclusion:

- there are many positive and negative aspects of the UNESCO WH inscriptions.
- All state parties should decide how they would like to use and re-use, above all: restore and save their own cultural heritage to the next generations.
- Not only a WH nomination can be a good tool.
- There are some other possibility, but the most important thing is the consistent state mechanism.

**István Varga**, Fort Monostor

The WH nomination of a trans-boundary property: "System of fortification at the confluence of rivers Danube and Váh in Komárno / Komárom"

- which was a joint nomination by the Hungarian and Slovakian States in 2007, and was re-called in, 2008).
- experiences of working on a joint nomination file, the mechanism of cooperation,
- questions and challenges of a joint management plan for a trans-boundary property like this fortress system,
- the conclusions of the application, and, of course, the new vision of the nomination.

**The groupwork:** the advantages and disadvantages of a WH label.

- the owners, the site managers, and the experts should cooperate from the first phase of a preparation of a WH nomination file.
- more important is the cooperation not only of the experts and managers, but all relevant stakeholders, like local people, decision makers, investors, etc. before the decision of a nomination to the tentative list.
- The nomination to the WH tentative list determines the future of an object, costs a lot of work, and is quite a long and expensive process.
- The strict rules of WH Convention determine the possible re-use, development schemes, use of materials, etc. after the inscription.
- In relation to the fortresses: there are many example of well used forts in Europe, which are also well preserved, protected, without WH label.
- There are many direct impact of a WH label, like raising number of visitors, prosperous local or regional tourism (and its effects to the economy), new jobs, better living conditions, conscious use of the cultural heritage, and so on.

As Prof. Dr. Jokilehto declare:

"The historic environment is an irreplaceable asset representing the investment of centuries of skills and resources. It gives places a unique competitive advantage. It generates jobs, attracts people to live in an area, business to invest and tourists to visit. Most of it is in everyday use; it is capable of an economic future; it is an asset we squander or degrade at our peril."