

WORLD HERITAGE WATCH

Stephan Doempke (ed.)



The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society



Proceedings of the International Conference
Bonn 2015

Published by World Heritage Watch

Stephan Doempke (ed.)

The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society

**Proceedings of the International Conference
Bonn 2015**

Published by

World Heritage Watch

Berlin 2016

Imprint

Doempke, Stephan (ed.)

The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society. Proceedings of the International Conference, Bonn 2015

230 pages, with 137 photos and 54 graphics and maps

Published by World Heritage Watch e.V.

Berlin 2016

ISBN 978-3-00-051953-6

NE: Doempke, Stephan

1. World Heritage 2. Civil Society 3. UNESCO 4. Participation 5. Natural Heritage 6. Cultural Heritage 7. Historic Cities
8. Sites 9. Monuments 10. Cultural Landscapes 11. Indigenous Peoples 12. Participation



© World Heritage Watch e.V. 2016

This work with all its parts is protected by copyright. Any use beyond the strict limits of the applicable copyright law without the consent of the publisher is inadmissible and punishable. This refers especially to reproduction of figures and/or text in print or xerography, translations, microforms and the data storage and processing in electronical systems.

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinions whatsoever on the part of the publishers concerning the legal status of any country or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the frontiers of any country or territory. The authors are responsible for the choice and the presentation of the facts contained in this book and for the opinions expressed therein, which are not necessarily those of the editors, and do not commit them.

No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without written permission from the publishers except for the quotation of brief passages for the purposes of review.

sponsored by



Foundation for International Dialogue
of the Savings Bank in Bonn



Centre for German and European Studies
St. Petersburg State University

www.dbu.de

This publication has been produced with support by the German Environment Foundation, the Foundation for International Dialogue of the Savings Bank Bonn, and the Centre for German and European Studies of St. Petersburg State University and University of Bielefeld. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of World Heritage Watch e.V. and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the German Environment Foundation.

Editorial Team

Stephan Doempke (chief editor) with support from Elena Belokurova, Matthew Hatchwell, Courtney Hotchkiss, Prof. Michael Turner and Dr. Maritta von Bieberstein Koch-Weser

Design and Layout: Bianka Spieß, www.layoutmanufaktur.de

Printed by: Buch- und Offsetdruckerei H.Heenemann GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin

Acknowledgements

The conference and subsequent publication of its proceedings would not have been possible without the support of most dedicated people to whom we are greatly indebted and sincerely thankful. A conference of this scope was the first of its kind in Germany. It has been not a small task to organize it from scratch within a few months, but we are glad that we accepted the challenge, and thanks to all those who shared our commitment and concern we managed. Their encouragement will motivate us far beyond the completion of this project and publication.

Generous support came from the German Federal Environmental Foundation (Deutsche Bundesstiftung Umwelt, DBU). Ms. Undine Kurth encouraged us to submit a proposal, and Dr. Paul Bellendorf and Felix Gruber made every effort to help us, and without their and the DBU's General Secretary's goodwill we would not have been able to realize the conference. Our sincere thanks go to Dr. Paul Bellendorf and Ms. Heike Hemmer also for their always positive attitude, constructive advice and friendly cooperation during the implementation of the project.

We were also generously supported by the City of Bonn through the Foundation for International Dialogue of the Bonn Savings Bank. We are glad that the City of Bonn, being Germany's UN City, supports the complementary civil society in this context. We highly appreciate the welcoming spirit and supportive cooperation of Bonn's officials, and the welcome by its Mayor.

The German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety came to our support in a straightforward way to co-fund international travel, ensuring that the conference could be truly international.

Several other foundations and organizations supported us by covering travel costs for participants, most notably the German-Russian Exchange (Deutsch-Russischer Austausch) and the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation, the Heinrich Böll Foundation and the International Campaign for Tibet. The Centre for German and European Studies at the St.Petersburg State University and University of Bielefeld sponsored travel and weeks of work of Elena Belokurova and Aleksander Zverev before, during and after the conference. The conference would not have been possible also without the many individuals and NGOs who came or sent representatives on their own cost, showing to us that they considered our initiative to be significant and worthy of support. To name them all here would

be beyond scope, but their full list can be found at the very end of this publication, and we cherish each one of them.

We are greatly indebted to the authors for their cooperation in the compilation of the materials for this publication, to Prof. Michael Turner for spending days in making the Final Document the concise and consistent piece that it has become. While the facts and opinions presented in the book remain those of the authors, all editorial shortcomings of course are only the responsibility of the editor.

Far beyond the financial support we received, most of the work both for the conference and for the proceedings has been done on a voluntary un-remunerated basis, by people who feel committed to World Heritage and for that matter, to World Heritage Watch. Phenomenal voluntary support made the conference and proceedings come true: First and foremost, Elena Belokurova was our principal counterpart on the Russian side. From disseminating the Call for the Conference to organizing travel and visa procedures and bringing the texts, photos and maps together, she did everything that concerned the Russian-speaking participants. Moreover, she led the team of volunteers during the conference itself, and on top of that organized the translation and editing of the Russian language version of these proceedings. Her contribution has been invaluable.

Maria Leonor Perez, Chi Nixon and Laura Bailey helped for weeks in reaching out to potential participants of the conference, and Asanti Astari, Philip Gondecki, Courtney Hotchkiss, Nadezhda Krasilnikova, Juliane Stöhr, Zarina Zinnatova and Aleksandr Zverev were the ones who made sure that the conference proceeded smoothly and who acted as rapporteurs during the sessions. After the conference, Courtney Hotchkiss became a pillar in the editing work when the English texts for the proceedings had to be checked by a native speaker, joined for some cases by Matthew Hatchwell. Alessia Montacchini also helped editing short biographies. Their support and cooperation will not be forgotten.

All our moderators also worked on a voluntary basis, and we were both lucky and honoured that such eminent personalities as Francesco Bandarin, Mounir Bouchenaki, Christina Cameron, Elke Falley-Rothkopf, Inge Gotzmann, Günter Mitlacher and Michael Turner took the interest and responsibility to lead through the sessions and ensure focused discussions and good results.

We are greatly indebted to our graphic designer Bianka Spiess who was ready to fulfill every one of our wishes and went out of her way in order to improve all the photos and graphics in this publication and make their legends better readable.

Last but not least, we would like to thank Hans Schauerte and his assistant Soleiman Kabir who, supported by a private donor, volunteered to record part of the conference on video and produce the beautiful clip of the conference which can be found on YouTube and the website of World Heritage Watch. They have created a lasting document that, as much as the publication in front of you, will help us always to remember this memorable event.

A Note on the Contributions

We are aware that the texts of these proceedings are too short to give a comprehensive or profound insight into the subjects they deal with. Available resources simply set us a limit. On the other hand, this kept the proceedings to a readable volume. All our authors will be happy to provide more detailed information and can be contacted through email. This publication can only open up the subject to a broader audience and raise an interest for a deeper understanding of the issues, and if we should achieve this, we have made a great step on our way.

The board of World Heritage Watch:

Stephan Dömpke

Uli Frank Gräbener

Dr. Gudrun Henne

Prof. Dr. Rolf Kreibich

Dr. Maritta von Bieberstein Koch-Weser

Contents

I. OPENING SESSION. 9

Addresses 9

Jürgen Nimptsch, Lord Mayor of Bonn

Dr. Christiane Paulus, German Federal Ministry for the Environment,
Nature Conservation, Building, and Nuclear Safety

Daniela Glagla, Rosa Luxemburg Foundation

Keynote Address. 13

Stephan Doempke, World Heritage Watch

Special Presentations. 15

The Rescue of the Manuscripts of Timbuktu 16

Dr. Abdel Kader Haïdara, Sauvegarde et Valorisation des Manuscrits pour la Défense de la Culture Islamique (DCI-SAVAMA)

The Great Earthquake of 25 April 2015. 19

Susanne von der Heide, HimalAsia Foundation

Strategies for the Involvement of Civil Society in the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention . . 23

Towards an Involvement of Civil Society in the World Heritage Convention. 24

Francesco Bandarin (on behalf of Mr. Kishore Rao, Director of the World Heritage Centre)

ICOMOS and the Civil Society: Constructing Bridges for a Common Work 26

Alfredo Conti, International Council for Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS)

Securing Civil Society's Contribution to the World Heritage Convention 28

Tim Badman, International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

The Rights of Indigenous Peoples in the World Heritage Convention. 30

Max Ooft, Vereniging van Inheemse Dorpschouwen in Suriname (VIDS)

II. CONTRIBUTIONS OF NGOS TO THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE WORLD HERITAGE. 33

Natural Heritage NGOs 33

Threats to Russian Natural World Heritage Properties from Development Projects 34

Mikhail Kreindlin and Andrey Petrov, Greenpeace Russia

The Extractives Industry and Natural World Heritage Sites: A Review of the Issues 37

Dr. Noëlle Kümpel, Zoological Society of London

With contributions from Yolande Kyngdon-McKay, James Wingard, Liz Clarke, Vivi Bolin,

Surshti Patel, Abra Kaiser, Sophie Grange, Susanne Schmitt, Alasdair Davies

The Living Lakes Network and Natural World Heritage: Experiences and Conclusions	40
Marion Hammerl, Global Nature Fund	
WWF’s Engagement in Natural World Heritage Sites – A Global Overview	43
Uli Frank Gräbener and Günter Mitlacher, WWF Germany	
Comparing Threats and Management Interventions in 20 Natural World Heritage Sites	47
Matthew Hatchwell, Charlotte Schep and Susan Lieberman, Wildlife Conservation Society	
Cultural Heritage NGOs	51
The World Monuments Fund: A Philanthropic Response to International Heritage Needs	52
Lisa Ackerman, World Monuments Fund	
The Global Heritage Fund’s Perspective on World Heritage	55
Stefaan Poortman, Global Heritage Fund	
Towards a Global Civil Society Alliance for Heritage	58
Sneška Quaedvlieg-Mihailović, Europa Nostra	
The Protection of the World Heritage is Essential – Including Kurdish Areas	61
Giyasettin Sayan, Kurdish Society for the United Nations	
The German Foundation for Monument Protection	64
Dr. Holger Rescher, Deutsche Stiftung Denkmalschutz	
III. ASSESSMENTS OF WORLD HERITAGE SITES	67
Natural Properties	67
The Tasmanian Wilderness: Civil Society Involvement in Protecting World Heritage	68
Geoff Law, Wilderness Society Australia	
Water Resource Management of Lake Baikal in the Light of Hydropower Development	72
Eugene Simonov, Rivers without Boundaries Coalition	
Tajik National Park: Conservation Challenges in a Low Income Country	75
Martin Lenk, CIM Expert in Tajikistan	
Implementation of UNESCO Decisions and New Threats in the Western Caucasus	79
Yuliya Naberezhnaya and Dmitriy Shevchenko, Ekologicheskoy Vakhty po Severnomu Kavkazu	
Pirin National Park in Bulgaria affected by Ski Development	82
Petko Tzvetkov, Toma Belev, Katerina Rakovska and Alexander Dountchev, For The Nature Coalition	
Historic Cities	85
Conservation of the Saint Petersburg World Heritage City: Major Concerns	86
Elena Minchenok, Vserossijskoye Obshestvo Okhrany Pamyatnikov Istorii i Kultury (VOOPIIK)	
Lessons from the Attempt to Conserve the Architectural Heritage of Lhasa’s Old Town	89
Pimpim de Azevedo and André Alexander, Tibet Heritage Fund	
Civil Society Preparing for the Reconstruction of the Historic Center of Aleppo	92
Dr. Anette Gangler, Freunde der Altstadt Aleppos	
The Transformative Tourism Development Group and Mozambique Island	96
Sana Butler, Transformative Tourism Development Group	

Monuments	99
The Role of Civil Society in Safeguarding Georgia’s World Heritage. Challenges and Outcomes.	100
Manana Tevzadze, National Committee of the Blue Shield, Georgia	
Touristic Reconstruction in Plovdiv, Bulgaria, in the Run-up to be a European Capital of Culture	103
Konstantina Pehlivanova	
Intensive Urban Development Surrounding the Cathedral of St. Sofia of Kyiv, Ukraine.	107
Igor Lutsenko, Zberezhy Staryy Kyiv	
Appropriation of Cultural Heritage by the Local Population on the Example of Belarusian Castles	110
Dr. Stsiapan Stureika, European Humanities University	
Sites	113
Civil Society vs. the City of Berlin: Saving the Historic Gas Lanterns of Berlin	114
Michael Strecker, “Denk mal an Berlin” and “DenkmalWacht Brandenburg-Berlin”	
Hellmut von Laer, “Denk mal an Berlin” and “yes2gaslicht.berlin”	
Again and Again “Trouble in Paradise”? The Berlin-Potsdam Cultural Landscape	117
Saskia Hüneke, Arbeitsgruppe für Umweltschutz und Stadtgestaltung Potsdam (ARGUS) ¹	
Archeological Sites, Local Populations and Power Structures in Butrint, Albania	121
Dana Phelps, Stanford University	
Between Conservation and Transformation: Involving the Local Community of Ivrea, Italy	124
Nicole De Togni and Francesca Giliberto, Politecnico di Torino ¹	
Civil Participation in the World Heritage Nomination of Diyarbakır, Turkey	128
Necati Piriñciođlu, Diyarbakır Consultative Committee	
Cultural Landscapes	131
The Engagement of Homeland Associations for the World Heritage in Germany	132
Dr. Inge Gotzmann, Bund Heimat und Umwelt in Deutschland (BHU) ¹	
Saving the Roman Water System and the Terraced Landscape of Battir, Palestine	136
Mohammed T. Obidallah, EcoPeace – Friends of the Earth Middle East	
Management Challenges and Civil Society Experience in the Region of Kotor, Montenegro.	140
Aleksandra Kapetanović, EXPEDITIO	
Engendering Civil Society Mobilization in four Cultural Landscapes of Nigeria	144
Dr. Musa Oluwaseyi Hambolu, Veritas University	
Empowering the Local Community for the Management of the Subak Landscape of Bali	147
Wiwik Dharmiasih and Yunus Arbi, Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia	
IV. LOCAL COMMUNITIES, INDIGENOUS PEOPLES, GOVERNMENTS AND UNESCO.	151
The World Heritage Convention and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples	151
Indigenous Peoples Participation in the Management of Bystrinsky Nature Park, Kamchatka.	152
Dr. Victoria N. Sharakhmatova, Assotsiatsiya korennykh malochislennykh narodov severa, Kamchatskovo kraiy	
Traditional Communities in World Heritage Properties: the Case of Ngorongoro (Tanzania).	156
Nicole Bolomey and Arpakwa M. Ole Sikorei	

Civil Society Participation in the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention: Challenges Ahead	167
Stephan Doempke, World Heritage Watch	
The Potential Roles of Civil Society Within UNESCO’s World Heritage Regime – an Analysis from a Multi-level Perspective	171
Thomas Schmitt, University of Augsburg / Erlangen	
Sacred Natural Sites, Indigenous Peoples’ Rights and Bio-Cultural Approaches to Nature Conservation¹	174
Robert Rode, Brandenburg University of Technology (BTU)	
The Second International Conference on Best Practices in World Heritage: People and Communities	176
Prof. Dr. Alicia Castillo, Complutense University of Madrid (UCM)	
on behalf of the Coordination Team: M.A. Querol, Isabel Salto-Weis,	
Jaime Almansa, Simón Gornes, Joana Goal and Cristóbal Marqués	
A Network of Local Communities and World Heritage in Colombia	179
Marcela Jaramillo Contreras	

V. RESOLUTIONS 183

Final Document	185
Statement I: On Civil Society Participation	192
Statement II: On Indigenous Peoples	193
Resolution 1: On No-go and No-impact Measures for Extractives Activities in Natural and Mixed World Heritage Sites	194
Resolution 2: On World Natural Heritage Properties in the Russian Federation	196
Resolution 3: On Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)	197
Resolution 4: On the Western Caucasus (Russian Federation)	198
Resolution 5: On the Preservation of Pirin National Park (Bulgaria)	199
Resolution 6: On Hasankeyf and the Iraqi Marshes	201
Resolution 7: On Threatened Cultural Heritage in Bulgaria	203
Resolution 8: On the Protection of St. Sofia and its Related Buildings, Kyiv (Ukraine).	204
Resolution 9: On the Gas Street Lamps in Berlin (Germany)	205
Resolution 10: On Lake Bogoria (Kenya).	206
Resolution 11: On the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Japan).	208

VI. ANNEXES 211

The Authors and Moderators	212
List of Participants	224
Conference Program	228
Donors	232

I. Opening Session



Addresses

Moderator: Stephan Doempke
(World Heritage Watch)

Jürgen Nimptsch, Lord Mayor of Bonn

**Ms. Paulus, Ms. Glagla, Mr. Doempke,
esteemed Panelists and Participants, Ladies and
Gentlemen,
Willkommen, Welcome, Bienvenue.**

Thank you for inviting me to open this conference in my capacity as Mayor of Bonn. As of Sunday, the 39th Meeting of the World Heritage Committee will be held at the World Conference Center Bonn. In the run-up to this UN conference, it is elementary to talk about the role of civil society in safeguarding, conserving and managing our common heritage as common property.

Bonn is an excellent place for this dialogue. Over the past two decades, the city has profiled as Germany's United Nations city and a hub for sustainable development. The UN is at the heart of a dense cluster of supporting organizations. Some 150 NGOs work from the banks of the Rhine as drivers of a global movement towards a better future.

Our city itself has a long history in conservation both of nature and of monuments. However, this important task could not be fulfilled to the current extent without the valuable contributions rendered by many NGOs in Bonn. Even our Old Town Hall dating from 1737 needs some private support: citizens founded a special association "Verein Altes Rathaus" in order to finance the restoration of artworks, which the city was unable to do at the time. Support by foundations, neighborhoods, associations, schoolchildren's initiatives, businesses – the preservation of common goods needs our common effort! I am grateful and proud that Bonn is a city rich in civil society commitment and in awareness of the true value of these goods.

Let us recall: in other parts of the world, precious cultural heritage must be defended even physically at times. This holds true for the war-struck regions of Syria or in Nepal, for instance, where earthquakes took away lives and existences, but also some irreplaceable monuments. Kathmandu is an example that touches me in particular, as I met the former CEO of the city on several occasions while debating our cities' resilience. The involvement of civil society is indispensable for stepping up resilience of cities around the globe! Non-governmental organizations all over the world have joined hands to help Nepal's people. And there will surely also be help when it comes to restoring some of the relics of former architectural abundance.

In the conflict zone between economic growth and conservation, it is often enough the NGOs who pull the lever and prevent or

stop exploitation and destruction. It is the NGOs that support indigenous communities in their efforts towards inclusion. It is the NGOs that mobilize people to engage with conservation and its management.

Conservation and the will to act for it are certainly questions of ownership. When you own something, be it material or immaterial, you cling to it, you only give it away for a seemingly appropriate price, or you just want to keep and protect it.

In Bonn, people are aware of the 2,000-year history of our city. And they pass down the stories to the next generation: of the Romans settling in the North, of mighty bishops and gifted musicians, of the founding of the Federal Republic of Germany and of the beginning of the UN era on the banks of the Rhine. They feel they are a part of the story themselves – they OWN it.

Like the children of the school where Roman relics have been found, who are proud to show them to every visitor! Like the members of our "Verein Altes Rathaus" who simply love our "municipal living room"! Who owns, will act responsibly and responsive. This applies to managing and conserving our common heritage as well.

It is the intangible values and the non-structural ones which are the most precarious. Like natural resources. Like indigenous knowledge. Like local traditions. In the Rhineland, we love our beautiful Rhenish carnival. We cherish the tradition, we do not only put pictures or figurines in a museum, but we sing the songs, we tell the stories, we organize events and we pass down our traditions to the next generation.

Civil society commitment is all about ownership. Those who own will get active – be it for material values or for intangible ones. This is perhaps why NGOs have such influence on the successful conservation and management of our World Heritage.

When I look through your dense programme, I see challenging two days ahead of you. Personally, I would encourage you to be ambitious in your discussions and to come up with some strong messages to the 39th meeting of the World Heritage Committee next week.

In between, I would like to thank you for highlighting again the importance of civil society commitment. Also, I would like to express my hope that your conference will be a nourishing ground for further networking and many joint projects.

Thank you.

Dr. Christiane Paulus, German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building, and Nuclear Safety

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It gives me great pleasure to be here with you today and to welcome you to Bonn. This NGO conference held immediately before the annual meeting of the World Heritage Committee shows how civil society engagement and the preservation of the UNESCO World Heritage are interconnected.

Hearing the point of view of NGOs is an important element in the World Heritage Committee's decision-making processes. As civil society activities take place locally, directly at the World Heritage sites and sometimes under difficult social and political conditions, they are extremely valuable to us all. In particular, they help raise public awareness of our world heritage. Your reports on what is going on at the World Heritage sites enhance the knowledge base of the World Heritage Committee. In addition, your activities are hands-on and you are close to the people, sparking their interest in actively preserving their own heritage. These contributions to the protection of World Heritage sites deserve our respect and recognition.

The goal of this conference - bringing together international NGOs from the fields of nature and heritage conservation - is a very important one. Civil society networks, both subject-based and regional, facilitate the exchange of information between World Heritage sites, regardless of whether these are part of the natural or the cultural heritage. We should not look at the World Natural Heritage or the World Cultural Heritage in isolation. Anthropogenic environmental impacts such as air pollution affect both the natural and the cultural heritage to the same extent. Climate change and other negative developments such as urban sprawl and increasing tourism do not stop at the borders of World Heritage sites. And ultimately, especially in these turbulent times, armed conflicts and political crises in many parts of the world are also a threat to humankind's common heritage.

However, there are also a lot of synergies between natural and cultural assets. The „mixed sites“ which combine natural and cultural heritage are a good example of this. 31 of the World Heritage sites currently listed into this category.

I am also very pleased that the conference will have a specific session dedicated to indigenous groups. There is a lot of potential for the protection and conservation of World Heritage sites in linking up the concerns of indigenous people with those of nature conservation. Indigenous groups can protect World Heritage sites from harmful influences, and at the same time the sites can offer these groups opportunities for economic participation.

Last but not least, I would like to highlight the important role of civil society in the German Development and Environment Ministries' international biodiversity cooperation.

A major factor for the success of this cooperation is your activities in the target countries, both as implementing agencies and supporters. Thanks to the commitment by many NGOs, more than 100 million Euro have been made available for various projects related to World Natural Heritage sites in recent years. For us, safeguarding the World Natural Heritage is an important first step towards sustainable development.

I would therefore like to take this opportunity to express my thanks for your commitment to the preservation of our precious world heritage. Thank you very much for your attention, I wish you a successful conference!

Daniela Glagla, Rosa Luxemburg Foundation

Ladies and Gentlemen,

as a member of the leadership council of the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation in North Rhine-Westphalia I welcome you to the international conference "The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society". I would like to thank World Heritage Watch for organizing this important conference.

I work for the Rhineland Regional Council which is pursuing to make possible a, for the most part, self-determined, active life for persons with disabilities. The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities is guiding the Rhineland Council to reach this goal.

This Convention represents a new model of involvement of non-governmental organizations with multilateral policy-making bodies at the global level. The full participation of civil society, in particular of persons with disabilities and their representative organizations, is essential in the national monitoring and implementation process.

The involvement of NGOs and disabled persons organizations is not only demonstrative of a paradigm shift in the way civil society interacts with multilateral institutions, but is also evident in the negotiated outcomes of the treaty. The participation of civil society in the reporting system creates better governance, as it tempers a government-centered perspective. For this reason the lately-released Concluding Observations on the initial report of Germany are very critical.

It has to be acknowledged that the consistent involvement of civil society is also an achievement of the disability rights movement, the dedication of people with disabilities and their success in joining forces.

The World Heritage Convention is not a human rights convention. Nevertheless it is related to rights and duties of humans - those who are connected to world heritage sites and their history. Responsibility for cultural and natural heritage belongs to the people who live or work at, or close to a site.

The Convention considers that "...it is incumbent on the international community as a whole to participate in the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value..."

Local communities have a different view on the situation of heritage sites, and can help to assess how they are threatened by environmental conditions.

Sometimes the requirements exceed the capacity of states or UNESCO institutions, and they face the risk to fail in protecting and preserving sites in danger due to conflicts, natural disasters, pollution or urbanization. Not only in these cases, as we may see in this conference, civil society actors such as NGOs, individual experts and representatives of academic and research institutions, members of professional groups, networks and community-based groups can play a crucial role. By accepting responsibility for the sites they support state institutions, and sometimes even make up for their lack of capacity to act.

In the last years, UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee have increasingly expressed the need that relevant communities be actively involved in the identification, management and conservation of all World Heritage sites. Awareness of the necessity to mobilize local communities by strengthening their sense of ownership has increased. This is a good precondition for the overdue recognition of the contribution of people to the culture of the world and their right to participate.

I am confident that this conference and the session of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee will give civic initiatives, indigenous and non-governmental organizations a more structured role within the context of the World Heritage Convention. And this will be an important step towards a broader comprehension of World Heritage policy as an interdisciplinary issue.

Keynote Address

Stephan Doempke, World Heritage Watch

In 2012, we convened on the first NGO Forum on World Heritage in St.Petersburg. It took us three years to come back together, but here we are – in greater numbers, and representing a much broader spectrum of civil society and indigenous peoples.

For the past eight months, we have made every effort to establish World Heritage Watch and to make a follow-up on St.Petersburg a reality. Thanks to many of you, we have succeeded, and from now on we will be here to stay.

In 2012, in St.Petersburg we had adopted three strategic resolutions: First and foremost: To establish an organization called World Heritage Watch.

I am happy to report that we have implemented this resolution. We have founded World Heritage Watch as a non-profit organization under German law, simply in order to have a legal body and a fundraising tool. At the same time, we have always been clear that this can only be a first step. During this conference we are looking forward to working with you on how to expand World Heritage Watch into a growing, representative international network. I invite all those interested among you to join the meeting we have scheduled on this topic for tomorrow afternoon.

In opening this gathering, let me say here how happy my World Heritage Watch colleagues and I are to see you all here. This was not achieved easily. We have people here from both the cultural and natural heritage communities. We have representatives of civil society from all continents - demonstrating that people all over the world share our concerns and our commitment to World Heritage. I would also like to highlight that all the original six people of the "initiative group" which formed after St.Petersburg to start World Heritage Watch are here with us. A warm welcome to all of you! And let me make a special mention of the fact that we also have among us representatives of indigenous peoples. We share their view that they have rights of their very own kind as subjects of international law. We welcome them also cordially in the midst of our community. We have made a special effort to invite them and make the platform we can offer available to them. I am personally more than happy that this invitation has been accepted, and I hope your experience will be rewarding. Please stay with us!

We know that sometimes differences of opinion exist between indigenous peoples and parts of the nature conservation community. I am deeply convinced that these differences are ultimately small and can be overcome congenially, in good spirit. I stand ready to do whatever I can to contribute towards this goal. At this conference, let us not look at our differences and show unity in our common concern for the World Heritage. We must stand together – there is only one world heritage, and it is for all of us.

Let me turn to the other two St. Petersburg resolutions, which have also been attended to by the establishment of World Heritage Watch.

The second resolution adopted in St. Petersburg calls for Access to Participation in all stages of the World Heritage procedures, and Resolution 3 refers to Access to Information. These two are linked since there can be no participation without having access to information. Participation, as we understand it, does not mean being informed after facts have been created, but rather being an equal part of a decision-making process from its very beginning.

We have seen a number of documents adopted by UNESCO which call for the participation of local communities, civil society, and indigenous peoples. We appreciate first steps taken by the Committee, such as livestreaming its Sessions. However, the task is not completed, and the two St.Petersburg resolutions remain at the top of our agenda until full and equitable participation of non-state actors have found their way into the statutory documents of the Convention. We renew our request for consultations with the Committee on this matter, and we urge the upcoming 39th Session to create the conditions for such consultations. On the conference we will specify how and where participation and access to information should be provided in the procedures of the Convention.

We have also seen meetings and publications where experts and officials talk about civil society and how it might be involved. Today, at this conference, civil society itself speaks! We know what we are able to do, we have our own highly qualified experts. At this conference, we will highlight our past and present contributions

and achievements, and we will formulate our ideas how to participate in the implementation of the convention in the future.

Why are we needed? What can we offer? The answer is told by the stories of the people in this room:

There are people doing day-to-day work restoring and improving monuments, teaching schoolkids about their heritage. People raising millions of Dollars every year to pay rangers, equipment, monitoring and trainings. Indigenous people who defend lands which they have kept in the very condition which qualified them to become World Heritage. People who obtain information from conflict zones under most difficult circumstances. People who start a social business in tourism with the purpose to save a world heritage city. People who come out in their hundreds to protect a wilderness threatened by logging. People stumbling through the rubbles of bombed Aleppo, risking their lives to salvage pieces of art for later reconstruction. People who keep a lifeline of communication with local inhabitants of Sukur, Nigeria, which is under control of Boko Haram. People challenging decisions based on economic interests because they believe in the obligation their country has to safeguard their natural heritage for the world. And I could go on. All these stories you will hear today and tomorrow.

All this tells us: Our biggest asset is our people. Obviously, UNESCO cannot be present at 1007 sites all the time, neither can ICOMOS or IUCN, nor, in many countries and remote places, can governments. But we can. There are local people everywhere who observe what is happening every day. They can provide up-to-date information which complement - and sometimes correct - information from other sources, and they can alert UNESCO to developments that otherwise would escape their attention.

Let us be clear: On only a few days of mission, the Advisory Bodies cannot gather - and check! - all the facts and fully understand hidden dynamics that may lead a site into jeopardy, but local people can. They can give an early warning which would save the Committee from having to deal with emergency situations, and their view on things will add an enriching perspective to official reports which will help the Statutory Bodies to have a more comprehensive understanding of the situation.

We are aware of the constraints under which UNESCO acts due to its nature as an inter-governmental organization. As civil society, we are not subject to such constraints – we can speak out in plain

language. Many times we can act, or act faster and more efficiently, when UNESCO must respect diplomatic procedures. Our organizations have many years of experience in mobilizing public opinion for the values which we all share and stand for.

And it is not that we don't have resources. I have asked some of the NGOs in our network about their annual budget for the world heritage, and only a few of them taken together spend in excess of 70 mio. USD, only in operational funds! And I am not talking about the thousands of volunteers working worldwide, and the money worth of their work. We believe that our contributions compare very well with those of UNESCO and State Parties, and we can say that probably without the work of civil society many World Heritage sites would have lost their outstanding universal value a long time ago. We have a legitimate request that this contribution is recognized and reflected in our possibilities to have a say in the work of the Convention. We are taking responsibility, but as much as rights don't come without responsibilities, responsibilities cannot be taken without rights.

We extend our hands to UNESCO, the Advisory Bodies and State Parties for cooperation. We don't want to do their job. We believe that there are things which the Statutory Bodies can do best, and there are other things that civil society can do best. In order to safeguard our most precious heritage, everyone's hand is needed. We want to help - help to preserve our heritage, to protect it and where necessary, to defend it. But we also want to be recognized and respected as partners on equal footing.

I had the blessing (and the curse) to learn the Latin language from which the word „culture“ is derived. „Colere“ means literally „to work the soil“, „to honour“, and „to take care“. Being cultivated people means to work on things, to honour them and to take care of them. This is a continuing task for anyone on this planet and for each new generation. The objects of the world heritage - both natural and cultural – are those which we should all honour the most and should take care of the most – it is here where we all can learn and demonstrate best to be cultivated people. To have the opportunity to become a person of culture is a basic human right. In this spirit, we request that the opportunity to take care of the objects of the World Heritage will be given not only to a few, but to everyone.

I wish you open hearts and minds, good spirits, strength and endurance in your deliberations today and tomorrow. Thank you.



Special Presentations

Moderator: Stephan Doempke
(World Heritage Watch)

The Rescue of the Manuscripts of Timbuktu

Dr. Abdel Kader Haïdara, *Sauvegarde et Valorisation des Manuscrits pour la Défense de la Culture Islamique (SAVAMA-DCI)*¹

One day after the arrival of the jihadists who had occupied Timbuktu, I went out to explore the situation of the town. I found shocking chaos throughout the city. The government district was particularly destroyed; offices had been looted, documents and writing tools destroyed and scattered all over the streets, all under the eyes of the helpless residents.



Fig. 1: The Sankoré Mosque in Timbuktu, a UNESCO World Heritage site, was severely damaged by the jihadists, but has been restored since then. Photo: wikipedia

Faced with this disaster, I began thinking a lot about the fate of the manuscripts, as these had already often been the target and victim of conquests and effects of war, particularly during the Moroccan uprising, the period of French colonization, and in the course of invasions of different tribes or clans. I posed a series of questions, such as:

- If the occupants (jihadists) attack the manuscript libraries, who can stop them?
- What can be done to protect the manuscripts from destruction and looting, with complete absence of the state, no possibility of prosecution and without any financial resources?

¹

I then hastened to contact the trustees of the manuscripts, to exchange views with them about the chaotic situation that held me and all the residents captive. I told them my concerns over the imminent danger to the manuscripts and suggested to secretly spread all manuscripts of the libraries on separate locations within different families. In this way, the manuscripts would be safe for about a month. They were kept in metal boxes, and storing them

with different families was based on the hope that this nightmarish situation would soon, somehow, come to an end.

After this initial success, I decided to first go to Bamako, the capital of Mali, to meet my colleagues: Dr. Abdoukadi Maïga, managing director of the Ahmed Baba Institute, and M. Ismail Diadié Haidara, director of the Fondo Kati Library. We made efforts to consult and negotiate with different organizations and institutions for the evacuation of the manuscripts, or their protection on site in Timbuktu.

We called on several embassies, ministries and government organizations in Mali, but we were denied access to their main leaders, which meant that our efforts and démarches within and around those structures remained completely inconclusive.

At the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research we had a meeting with the Secretary-General, Mr. Barthelemy Togo, the National Director, Mohamed Keita, as well as the technical adviser of the Ahmed Baba Institute, assigned to the Minister in the person of Professor Drissa Diakitè. During the meeting, which took place in the office of the Secretary-General, we informed the three officials on the dangers threatening the manuscripts.

The Secretary-General expressed his concern and agreed with our assessment that the documentary heritage was under extreme threat. However, because of the rampant disintegration of the state in Timbuktu, he could offer no support financially, politically or administratively. Nevertheless, he asked us to do everything possible to save this heritage. He said the administration could only be with us in their hearts, and he asked to be kept posted about developments. We were then received by the Secretary-General of the Minister of Culture, who, in principle, told us the same thing.

Frankly, we had expected these answers, but it was important to us that we had the agreement and internal support of the Malian government for the measures that I had planned with my colleagues. I felt that the involvement of the Malian state was important since the planned measures also included some risks, both for the documents themselves and for us.

When I saw the problems in northern Mali worsening from day to day, I decided to contact one of my diplomat friends outside Mali. I described the situation to him and asked him for advice. His

¹ Safeguarding and Recovery of Manuscripts for the Defense of Islamic Culture

answer was that unfortunately he had no resources to effectively help us. He advised me to rely on direct and personal contacts, and to make the well-meaning people around me volunteers and donors in favor of the scripts. I thanked him for his precious and wise advice and assured him to observe it carefully.

That is why I established fixed individual contact persons with my collaborative partners both inside and outside of Mali. Then I went to Geneva in order to look for friends who would assist me in smuggling the manuscripts out of the center of conflict. During this trip I met people who had been involved in the rescue and safeguarding of World Heritage artifacts in Afghanistan and Iraq. From them I received further important advice. A few days later I traveled to Dubai to meet the Director-General of the Juma Almajid Centre, Sheikh Juma Almajid. He gave me tips on how I could implement the plan as quickly and discreetly as possible, and provided me with a budget for the necessary operations.

After my return to Bamako I set up two working groups, one in Bamako and one in Timbuktu, as well as representatives who should ensure the shuttle between Timbuktu and Bamako. We selected homes for the storage of manuscripts in various districts of Bamako, and purchased mobile phones for everyone involved. Then we started to transport the first boxes of manuscripts to Bamako. In addition, I have also taken the help of other people whose names remain anonymous on their own request. They served as intermediaries between us and other partners.

The following organizations have responded to our requests: The Prince Claus Foundation and the DOEN Foundation in the Netherlands, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, and the German Embassy in Bamako. Later, I visited the West Africa Office of the Ford Foundation in Lagos, Nigeria, where I explained to the office manager, Dr. Adiambo Odaga, what we had achieved up to this point and what still remained to be done. The office assured us of the means for smuggling the remaining boxes. These were the partners who have supported the transfer of manuscripts from the beginning to the end. It is important for me to express to them our deepest appreciation and gratitude.

The operation took place in an extremely difficult environment since the security problems had spread all across Mali, from the north to the south. However, we were able to maintain a high pace of work, so that we managed to achieve the desired goals. Vehicles transported two to four camouflaged boxes per trip and came as far as Sevaré, where other borrowed vehicles continued the trip to Bamako. In this manner we proceeded until the end of December 2012.

When the jihadists began to gain ground in the middle of the country, we had to leave the major roads to Douentza because they were full of advancing armed groups. We had to continue the work on the waterway that begins near the villages around Timbuktu. The boxes were loaded into canoes and brought into the vicinity of Djenné, where they were, in turn, transported by

vehicles to Bamako. These works were carried out in strict secrecy and lasted from the beginning of August 2012 to the end of January 2013.

After evacuation of the manuscripts to Bamako we were faced with the problem of moisture during the rainy season. We were looking for houses with mezzanines between the ground floor and attic in order to protect the manuscripts against the inflow of water from roofs and possible floods from the ground floor. We were able to equip these houses with air-quality monitoring systems and dehumidifiers.



Fig. 2: Burnt ancient manuscripts at the Ahmed Baba Centre. Photo: The History Blog

At the same time we were able to compile inventories of all manuscripts that were ordered neither by theme nor by size: documents and volumes of different sizes, thematic books, correspondence, documents and various archives. The total number of manuscripts amounted to 377,491.

Prospects for a possible return of the manuscripts to Timbuktu

With regard to the return of the manuscripts to their place of origin (Timbuktu), our NGO SAVAMA-DCI has developed a five-year work plan from 2013-2018, which was drafted with the participation of librarians as well as Malian and Dutch experts. The program has the following objectives:

- Proper storage and physical preservation of the manuscripts which were evacuated from Timbuktu to Bamako;
- Digital recording, cataloging and representation of manuscript contents;
- Repair and restoration of the libraries in Timbuktu and the region;
- Continuation of research, and critical edition of the manuscripts.

From October 2013 to June 2015, under my leadership, SAVAMA-DCI was able to achieve important and sustainable partial results in order to fulfill the program:

- Hiring of ten houses for the storage of manuscripts, as well as a place for offices and workshops for working on the manuscripts;
- Renovation / upgrading / re-establishment of 22 libraries in Timbuktu and the region to regain the ability to work;
- Preparation of an inventory, in Arabic and French, of 78,028 manuscripts in nine libraries;
- Preservation of 55,524 manuscripts in 5,820 boxes produced specially for that purpose;
- Digitalization of 16,000 manuscripts in three libraries;
- Staff training in digital technologies, in the field of technical conservation and restoration, as well as in the field of cataloguing.

These measures were carried out with the support of the following partners, to whom we express our sincere gratitude at this point: The Ford Foundation (USA), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, the University of Hamburg (Germany), the Hill Museum & Manuscripts Library (USA), the Swiss Cooperation Office in Mali (SDC), the Gerda Henkel Foundation (Germany), the Luxembourg-Mali cooperation, Prince Claus Fund of the Netherlands, and T160K.

Nevertheless, in view of the numbers that we want to achieve within five years, it is also clear that much remains to be done:

- produce 90,000 boxes;
- digitalize 100,000 manuscripts;
- restore 40,000 manuscripts;
- catalog 50,000 manuscripts;
- edit and publish 15 manuscripts;
- work on 25 research subjects with respect to the manuscripts;
- recruit 25 students for research on the manuscripts;
- reconstruct 26 libraries;
- renovate 19 libraries.

However, we remain optimistic. In view of the given facts, we work in the best conditions thanks to the versatile support of our partners.

Participation of UNESCO

As a specialized agency of the United Nations, UNESCO is keenly interested in the situation of the tangible and intangible heritage, and concerned about the crisis in Mali and the occupation of the north. It has repeatedly called for the rescue and protection of cultural property in northern Mali. No sooner had these appeals for protection been published, the invaders responded with vandalism against the mausoleums and the monuments of the City of 333 Saints. Since this situation reoccurred, we decided to stop all operations for the time being in order to avert the greatest danger to the manuscripts and the people involved.



Fig. 3: Secret transport of manuscripts in metal boxes

Photo: Abdel Kader Haïdara / DCI-SAVAMA

I then got in touch with UNESCO and exchanged details of the situation with Mr. Lazarus Assomo Eloundou, who I knew had good knowledge of the site. I explained to him our concerns about the public UNESCO declarations which only seemed to provoke the invaders to destroy the cultural heritage of northern Mali. I told him that we would recommend UNESCO to stop the media campaign and in particular not to publicly address the matter of the manuscripts. Mr. Eloundou, who thought to act completely in the interest of UNESCO, was taken by complete surprise and asked me, „Why?“



Fig. 4: Digitalization of manuscripts.

Photo: Abdel Kader Haïdara / DCI-SAVAMA

I explained to him that their well-intended activity could undermine all our efforts since we had already started rescuing the manuscripts. He did not quite understand and asked me for a better explanation.

I hesitated to disclose all the details of our evacuation work, but in the end I fought my way through to reveal everything to him, with the unconditional request of the strictest secrecy even towards all the staff and participants at UNESCO. At last he understood, and the next morning he came back with an agreement to end all media relations if I promised to report to him every day on the progress of work. After we had agreed, we continued to work until we had completely evacuated all the manuscripts.

This exchange and cooperation with UNESCO has been helpful and fruitful for our initiative to save the manuscripts of Timbuktu. And this was an invaluable contribution on the part of the UN institution.

The Great Earthquake of 25 April 2015

Susanne von der Heide, HimalAsia Foundation

After the massive earthquake on 25 April 2015 a 7.8 on the Richter scale with frightening aftershocks registering at 7.4, the preceding weeks since then had clearly been one of the most harrowing periods in Nepal's modern history. Out of the 75 districts of Nepal, 39 districts in the Western and Central regions were affected; nine of them, from Rasuwa to Solukhumbu (the Mount Everest region) and the three districts of the Kathmandu Valley, have borne the brunt of the impact. Traditional mud and mortar houses have been demolished on a very large scale in a much wider area, including Gorkha, Lamjung, Manang and Mustang.



Fig. 1: Hanuman Dhoka Palace area, a UNESCO World Heritage Site at the Durbar Square in Kathmandu.

Photo: Susanne von der Heide / HimalAsia

As of 3 of June, the government of Nepal has confirmed 8,778 deaths and more than 22,000 injured people. Over half a million homes have been fully demolished, 291,707 were partially damaged, and 4,113 schools across the country have been destroyed or damaged so far. The UN estimates that eight million people have been affected and 2.8 million people are displaced and need humanitarian assistance. It is further estimated that nearly 1 million people have been pushed back below the poverty line because of the earthquake. Moreover, many villages need to be relocated, and internal migration in the country will continue as a result of the earthquake.

Besides the devastating loss of lives, the earthquake has destroyed much of the cultural heritage of Nepal, bringing down important

religious and historic monuments in old Kathmandu, Patan, Bhaktapur, the surrounding small cities and villages of the Kathmandu valley and the Khavre district (Panauti, Banepa, Dhulikhel), as well as in Nuwakot and Gorkha. Many of these ruined buildings, including the vernacular heritage, are UNESCO World Heritage Sites or have been inscribed on the Tentative List.

Besides the destruction of major heritage sites in the district of Mustang, some of the old monasteries and rock cave temples have been completely damaged or cracked, like, for example, the icon of the ancient city of Lo Manthang, a palace from the 15th century. Huge numbers of ancient monuments and important traditional buildings are in need of restoration, and if they are not restored, they will be demolished and rebuilt.

The government's Department of Archaeology, which had set up an emergency coordinating section with the support of UNESCO Kathmandu to salvage and secure destroyed heritage sites, estimates that the earthquake and its aftershocks demolished 133 monuments completely and damaged around 608 others across the



Fig. 2: At the Durbar Square in Bhaktapur, which is a UNESCO World Heritage Site. The Vatsala Temple has been completely destroyed.

Photo: Susanne von der Heide / HimalAsia

country (not including the numerous Stupas and Chorten in the Buddhist areas that have been destroyed). Other assessments are higher. In Bhaktapur alone, the municipality specifies that around




Fig. 3: Hanuman Dhoka Durbar Square Kathmandu, a UNESCO World Heritage Site. The damaged temple sites have been marked with red colour.

Map: ICOMOS

120 important ancient sites, such as temples, maths, sattals and *pathis*, are completely ruined or damaged; it is difficult to give an accurate number. Moreover, so many cultural buildings are structurally unsound and are desperately in need to be reinforced.

For reconstructing public buildings as well as historical monuments, 'The Nepal Earthquake 2015 Disaster Relief and Recovery Fund' was established by the Ministry of Home Affairs together with the National Planning Commission of the Government of Nepal in order to collaborate with the international community and donors to offer substantial relief support. At a recent meeting of the Nepalese Federal Buddhist Association, it was stated that in 34 districts, Buddhist temples and monasteries have been partially or fully damaged - the 8 Million Rupees promised by the Nepalese Government for rebuilding and repairing these sites would not be at all sufficient.

'Devastated but not Defeated' (Kathmandu Post on May 6, 2015)

The disaster has brought people together in unknown ways. The sense of national duty that young Nepalis have shown is perhaps the biggest story of the Great Earthquake. Their perseverance and

hope that the situation would get better is inspiring. They were the last ones to complain about the non-performing political class and the first ones to respond to the national crisis together with the Nepalese Army.

There were scores of selfless volunteer groups that worked tirelessly. Most of the volunteerism was spontaneous networking to get through to the supply chain. Groups of Nepalis were working around the clock to deliver relief support in the best possible way. There was little that was used in overhead costs or had the possibility of misuse. The processes were transparent, as a lot of information was broadcast over social media, taking accountability and transparency to a high level. The operations of the recovery are providing a good example from which international organisations can learn.

While the elected coalition government was rightly lambasted for its lack of coordination, various government mechanisms worked tirelessly. Besides the Army, the Police and Air Traffic Control displayed their potential. The government telecommunications and power companies worked relentlessly, and even bureaucrats worked around the clock. The supportive attitude and the concern of the driven Nepalis can be humbling to anyone.

The time since the earthquake has been and still is a traumatic experience for the Nepalese people: the continuing aftershocks, sleeping outside, the rains, the uncertainty and now the monsoon which has begun to pour down and destabilize towns and mountains. However, fortunately, the situation seems to be slowly turning as many services have been restored in Kathmandu, and relief and recovery efforts are underway. This is also true for some of the cultural heritage sites; many individuals and institutions in Nepal have shown support.



Fig. 4: The Army was helping everywhere; at the completely damaged Radha Krishna Temple in Patan, army soldiers rescued some of the fragments of the temple site.

Photo: Susanne von der Heide / HimalAsia

The Nepalese Army was seen as the most organised force in terms of being prepared to conduct relief and rescue works and to protect the architectural remains of destroyed cultural heritage sites. Young people have been their first helping hands in retrieving and securing artefacts that were found in the debris of damaged temple complexes, *stupas* and other monuments. They gathered sculptures and other stone and wooden elements that were found around the damaged sites and transferred them to safe places. Because of their work, many of the collected wooden structures, struts and carved beams can be reused in the future when the destroyed buildings will be reconstructed.

At the World Heritage Sites, artefacts were kept at temporary storage facilities that had been selected for this purpose by the Archaeological Department, partly in collaboration with the responsible communities living there. For example, the remains of the Vatsala Temple have been gathered and secured at the 55 Window Palace by the local community and young volunteers. In Changu Narayan the Army supported the Museum staff which salvaged their dispersed art objects, dug them out of the rubble and prevented the site from being looted. Furthermore, the local community living at Swayambhu was afraid of looting, so the Army sent soldiers to guard the site. Most of their private houses had been destroyed and several small *stupas* had collapsed completely, so that statues, scripts and other historical artefacts had been exposed at Swayambhu. At the Kathmandu Durbar Square alone, 150 soldiers had been appointed to help secure and salvage the remains of the destroyed heritage sites there.

Preventive action to secure remaining historic structures and cultural collections were discussed on an emergency meeting at the UNESCO Kathmandu Office right after the quake, where the 'Nepal Heritage in Crisis Group' was initiated. Young Nepalese and foreign participants joined who had heard of this meeting and simply wanted to help or offer special expertise. Also the Department of Archaeology had sent their representatives to the Crisis Group, where they became part of special teams. Each of the actors in the team was given a special task to carry out in the next weeks to follow, including damage assessment and emergency documentation of movable and immovable heritage sites. In this context, different training programs have been arranged for those teams in order to learn how to operate a computer-based emergency documentation system for movable and immovable heritage that had been successfully used in the field before.

In another activity, students of the Kathmandu University offered their help to the old village of Bungamati, where more than 80 per cent of the houses and historical sites had been destroyed including the famous Rato Macchendranath Temple. They formed groups that took over different tasks; the research group documented information regarding the historical and cultural significance of the area and collected statistical data on the number of people and houses in Bungamati. The construction group built bamboo frame houses and toilets, while the sanitation group removed the waste that was produced in the area, separating degradable and non-degradable material. The outreach group worked with the children of the community and engaged them in various art activities. The students also plan to help people reconstruct Bungamati, following traditionally accepted techniques and aesthetics, as they expressed in a statement given by the Kathmandu University.

Furthermore, architects and engineers and their respective organisations have been extremely helpful regarding the Post Disaster Safety Assessment of buildings, including some of the heritage sites and historic buildings. Their inspection teams classified houses under three categories: 'safe for living', 'must be repaired for living' and 'unsafe for living'.

The reconstruction and restoration of heritage sites and traditional buildings after the earthquake will be a challenge, but also a chance for Nepal; thousands of skilled and semi-skilled workers will be needed who can be paid salaries at par with what they would earn in the Middle East, where many Nepalese are working as labour migrants now. This is an opportunity to create institutions that will train these people in order to create skilled workers that can help to rebuild Nepal's destroyed cultural fabric.

In the recovery phase, support has to be given to heritage-related craft industries, since their role is important, not only in context of restoring the devastated culture with traditional materials and techniques, but also in regard to regaining economic strength. So many working places of families whose livelihoods are linked with heritage have been destroyed, for example, potters, traditional *paubha* painters and mask makers, statue casters, stone masons or

weavers; here, additional programs to assist these families should to be considered. Many of them are tremendously dependent from the tourism industry, a sector that will take years to recover, with around 850,000 tourists visiting the country every year.

After all this encouraging solidarity shown among the civil society during the disaster, it is expected that Nepal's political parties will come together now to cope with the tasks ahead. This means, first, providing relief and rehabilitation, second, a robust

plan for disaster management, and finally, eventually, completing the unfinished peace process.

However, the heritage of Nepal is, in a sense, indestructible, because its culture is a living one. The Nepalese people rebuilt most of the monuments and homesteads by themselves that came down in a similar disaster, during the earthquake of 1934. This time, there might be many others that can lend them a helping hand.



Strategies for the Involvement of Civil Society in the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention

Moderator: Stephan Doempke
(World Heritage Watch)

Towards an Involvement of Civil Society in the World Heritage Convention

Francesco Bandarin (on behalf of Mr. Kishore Rao, Director of the World Heritage Centre)

Dear Friends and colleagues,

I would like first of all to bring to you greetings from the Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre that I have the pleasure to represent today at this meeting.

I would like to thank the colleagues of World Heritage Watch and Stephan Dömpke in particular for organising this meeting. It has been a hard but indeed a very successful effort. You deserve our appreciation and applause!

Your effort allows Civil Society Organisations to meet again, the second time after the inaugural meeting held in St. Petersburg in 2012, where the idea of a Forum preceding the World Heritage Committee was first tested.

This second workshop should allow us to discuss - besides many important heritage conservation issues - the ways in which this Forum can become a permanent feature in the life of the World Heritage Convention, and the forms and functions that the Forum should take in the future.

Needless to say, we are all convinced that Civil Society Organisations have an important role to play in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, like they do for many other important international treaties, such as the Bio-diversity Convention or the Framework Convention on Climate Change.

After all, what is the added value of an international treaty if not to create public attention, mobilize energies and resources, develop outreach? To have an impact, a Convention has to involve Civil Society Organizations, it simply cannot act alone.

How can a Convention deal with situations generated by conflicts, natural disasters or even simply by ordinary management problems without the full cooperation with Civil Society Organizations? Institutions cannot survive in an ivory tower; they need to be supported by society. Indeed, no effective conservation policy is even conceivable without society's engagement.

And yet, if we compare it with many other Treaties, the World Heritage Convention seems to lag behind in the recognition of the

role of Civil Society Organisations. It still remains largely centred on the role of States Parties and of Governmental Bodies, even in a situation of diminishing public resources for conservation, of increasing impacts of conflicts, natural disasters and other threats to heritage conservation.

However, in recent years we have witnessed some important changes to this approach, partly related to internal reflections, and partly linked to the political initiative UNESCO has promoted in support of a greater role for Culture in the new Sustainable Development Goals to be adopted at the end of the year 2015. This has created a momentum that is favourable to a greater role of Civil Society Organisations in the implementation of the Convention.

As I said, so far the Convention has been very shy in recognising the role of Civil Society Organisations. It is true that the Advisory Bodies, ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM are cited in the text of the Convention, but they are essentially seen as service providers, not as representatives of organisations working on heritage preservation (and in reality, only IUCN matches this definition).

The text of the Convention is vague on the issue, and in any case it adopts a "top-down" posture, when referring to the social role of heritage. The Convention in fact speaks to the policy-makers, not to the people concerned with the conservation process, as it is evident in its formulation:

"Article 5

...

(a) to adopt a general policy which aims to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes;"

This posture has been confirmed all along the history of the Convention, and until recent times. I think many of you remember what happened in 2001, when the Committee rejected the proposal to establish a "World Heritage Indigenous People Council of Experts", supported by Canada and other countries, but opposed by many countries that saw it as a political intrusion in their own

decision-making process (admittedly, this happened before the adoption by the UN of the Declaration on the Rights of the Indigenous Peoples in 2007).

Fortunately, after that things started changing. The turning point can be considered the adoption, in 2007, of the 5th 'C' (Communities) within the framework of the strategic objectives, a long-due decision that was facilitated by the role played by New Zealand, the host of the Committee that year in Christchurch.

Since then, some progress was made, as shown by the choice of the theme for the 40th anniversary celebrations in 2012: *World Heritage and Sustainable Development – The Role of Local Communities*.

Today, the World Heritage Convention is in the process of aligning itself with the approach promoted by other UNESCO Conventions, like the 2003 Convention on the Protection of the Intangible Heritage, which gives the communities and their organizations a primary role in the safeguarding of heritage, or the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, which bases its very action on the reinforcement of the role of civil society.

In order to accompany this transition, we need to understand the reasons of this delay in the evolution of the World Heritage Convention. I do not have a full answer to this question, but I see at least the following issues that need to be addressed:

- a) The Convention was adopted long ago, when many of the issues we are discussing were not yet at the forefront. It reflects a 'technical' vision of heritage, as something so special that needs to be 'extracted' from its context. Obviously, this approach would perhaps be possible if the World Heritage sites were the 100 ones envisaged by the founding fathers -as the research of Christina Cameron has shown us.
- b) The main focus of the Convention has traditionally been the nomination process. This is why it's not unusual to have in the room the representatives of local communities during the nomination, as this an important moment of recognition. But we rarely see them when there are problems, when the State of Conservation shows a lack of governance, or threats.
- c) Because of the UN context of the Convention, and because of its high visibility, many countries fear a political use of the Convention. This concerns local issues, where often the role of the Convention is used in political controversies, or international issues, linked to borders, occupied territories or shared heritage.
- d) The Committee cannot deal with the large number of existing organizations, and needs to be put in the position to have a limited number of interlocutors.

In spite of these issues, however, we have seen positive changes in the relationship between the Committee and Civil Society Organizations, as proven by the fact that the Committee is increasingly willing to offer the floor during the sessions. Although the situation is still far from ideal, it is definitely improving.

I think that to improve it further the Civil Society Organizations need to create the necessary infrastructure and develop some internal rules and, in order to allow a better interface and dialogue. After all, the great Civil Society Organizations that deal with the key environmental issues in UN Fora are highly organized groups, with internal working rules and representative bodies. This is no small reason for the successful advocacy of their causes and for their recognized public role.

There is also the need of a wider public outreach. Today, few web sites or digital platforms exist that represent the views of Civil Society Organizations dealing with the World Heritage Convention. This is an area where a lot of work needs to be done.

This symposium will discuss ways to strengthen the role of Civil Society Organizations in the World Heritage Convention. I think you have certainly already examined the many facets of this issue, and I can only conclude with some suggestions.

First of all, I think you should work towards obtaining a formal acknowledgment by the Committee of the role Civil Society Organizations play in the implementation of the Convention. This can take the form of a Decision acknowledging, for instance, the organization of the Forum before the Committee session as a regular event, like it has become customary to have the Young People Forum.

Secondly, I believe it will be important for you to obtain a Decision that a Report on the conclusions of the Forum be presented at the Committee session, as part of the series of Reports it receives regularly. These Reports do not need to be approved, but just acknowledged.

Perhaps, at some point, it will be useful to study the possibility to establish a Roster of NGOs affiliated to the Convention, as is common practice in other Conventions. This might be a useful way to recognize the role of Civil Society Organizations.

However, as I mentioned earlier, change will not come unless Civil Society Organizations are able to structure themselves, become organized, adopt transparent working rules and show concretely the ways in which they can support the implementation of the Convention.

I wish you all a successful symposium and look forward to its conclusions and recommendations.

ICOMOS and the Civil Society: Constructing Bridges for a Common Work

Alfredo Conti, International Council for Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS)

ICOMOS would like to thank the kind invitation of the World Heritage Watch network to attend the International Conference “World Heritage and Civil Society”, held in Bonn, Germany, on 26-27 June 2015. This gives the opportunity to disseminate among different stakeholders the work and methods of ICOMOS with regard to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and to define next steps for future common work.

The International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) was established in 1965; with more than 100 national committees, 29 International Scientific Committees and some 10,000 individual members throughout the world, it is the main organization of its type at the international level. ICOMOS has been appointed as one of the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee. With regard to the implementation of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention, ICOMOS is in charge of evaluating cultural and mixed properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List, reporting on state of conservation and monitoring of inscribed properties, carrying out advisory missions to States Parties of the Convention, reviewing of requests for international assistance through the World Heritage Fund and, in general, contributing to the objectives of the Global Strategy. ICOMOS also undertakes thematic studies related to specific heritage types at global or regional levels and conducts specific programmes related to the implementation of the Convention.

ICOMOS relies on its global network of members in National Committees and its International Scientific Committees to provide independent and scientifically robust evaluations and advice to the World Heritage Committee. Importantly, ICOMOS members contribute to the understanding, credibility and integrity of the World Heritage system through their own professional work. In this way, the World Heritage programme and the wider mandate of ICOMOS have a dynamic inter-relationship, and there are continuous efforts to improve on and benefit from the World Heritage mandate as a tool for conservation of the entire world’s cultural heritage.

Over the last decades there have been significant changes in the field of heritage. One of them is the extension of the very concept

of heritage, which encompasses today a wide range of natural and cultural, tangible and intangible components which are closely interrelated in a complex and dynamic system. New heritage categories and types, such as cultural landscapes or cultural routes, extend the notion of heritage to a territorial and sometimes inter-continental scale. The consideration of intangible cultural heritage related to tangible heritage assets imply new challenges which require fresh approaches at both conceptual and operational levels. All this implies, at the same time, the expansion of professional background and skills required in the process of heritage protection and conservation; whereas cultural heritage used to be a main concern for architects, art historians and archaeologists, a wide range of professions are included today in the task, among them those related to social sciences such as anthropology, sociology and economy.

This conceptual expansion reaches also the range of stakeholders acting in the process of heritage protection. Civil society, and especially local communities related to heritage properties, have become a fundamental actor in the identification, protection and management of heritage. This implication of local communities has an impact, for example, in the identification of values attributed to heritage: besides historic and artistic values, we consider today social and communitarian significance of buildings, sites and places. Civil society has also a primary role in the process of heritage management, especially when considering heritage as an instrument for sustainable development.

Challenges and threats have also expanded in a world in permanent process of change. Pressures caused by development projects, the global climate change or the increase of mass tourism at global scale require new and more complex approaches to deal with heritage conservation. In this framework, the coordinated work among different stakeholders becomes a primary requirement. Social actors dealing with heritage conservation and management can be summarized in three basic categories: governmental authorities at all levels, experts and professionals and civil society; each of them plays specific roles which are at the same time interlinked and must be in place to ensure the success of the process.

This is especially important when dealing with World Heritage properties since they, although located in territories of and managed by specific States Parties to the Convention, bear outstanding universal value which is important for present and future generations of humanity. The importance of local communities in the management processes was recognized in 2007 when a “fifth C” (communities) was added to the strategic objectives of the World Heritage Committee, and in 2012 for the commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention, when the selected theme for reflection and discussion was “World Heritage and sustainable development: the role of local communities”. The last international documents dealing with heritage, among them the 2011 UNESCO Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscape, stress the necessity of including civil society and local communities as a main actor of heritage conservation and management.

ICOMOS considers civil society a primary social actor and a necessary partner in the work related to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, especially taking into account that most of the cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List or nominated for inscription are inhabited or located in inhabited environments. These sites, cities or territories house communities whose necessities and expectations change over time; it becomes thus necessary to define, with their active participation, how to adapt those spaces to new requirements and to consider social changes without compromising or threatening heritage values.

People who are directly related to heritage properties have the capacity and the opportunity to act as a sort of watchdog that can immediately react in case of threats to the outstanding universal value of the sites or to their integrity or authenticity. They are the owners and primary users of heritage, and the body which legitimate the values attributed to heritage; this places civil society as a fundamental interlocutor in the dialogue conducting to heritage protection. In fact, meetings with civil society organizations are usually planned and held in the case of evaluation or reactive monitoring missions, and the exchange is always useful. It is worth mentioning that a section of ICOMOS evaluation reports is devoted to involvement of local communities.

Although this useful exchange is sometimes in place, methods and mechanisms for a relationship between ICOMOS and civil society organizations have not been formalised yet, and not always communication channels are clearly defined. That is why ICOMOS considers that this International Conference can be the starting point of a more regular and formal dialogue conducting to a fruitful contribution for both sides.

It becomes necessary to acknowledge, nevertheless, that when we speak about civil society we are not necessarily referring to a homogeneous body; within civil society there are different groups and individuals than can have different visions, interests and expectations, sometimes not aiming at preserving heritage. This can constitute one of the constraints when identifying which groups or organization should or may be contacted to contribute to evaluations or assessment’s of state of conservation of the properties.

That is why ICOMOS considers that a task to be undertaken, with the help of already existing and active civil society organizations, is the elaboration of a directory and data base of those organizations that could be consulted and integrated to ICOMOS activities related to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

ICOMOS has a category of affiliated member, open to individuals, institutions and organizations that are interested in cultural heritage conservation and wish to support the aims and activities of the association; this allows welcoming civil society organizations as members. According to ICOMOS Statutes, the application to become affiliate members must be submitted through national committees for approval by the Bureau. This possibility of becoming affiliate members could be a means to actively and formally incorporate civil society organizations in the work of ICOMOS.

Finally, ICOMOS would like to stress once again the importance of participation of civil society in the protection of World Heritage sites and to confirm its readiness and willingness to construct bridges for a fruitful and continuous cooperation and common work.

Securing Civil Society's Contribution to the World Heritage Convention

Tim Badman, International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

IUCN wishes to thank World Heritage Watch for the invitation to speak to this meeting. We spoke at the first NGO Forum on World Heritage held in St Petersburg, and welcome that this has led to the creation of World Heritage Watch. We consider this is an important initiative to involve civil society more strongly in the work of the World Heritage Convention. IUCN is a membership organization with both States and Civil Societies as our members. We work on a continuous basis with the States Parties to the Convention of course, but World Heritage needs all of the actors to be in the room at World Heritage Committee meetings, and throughout every year supporting the delivery of World Heritage on the ground, in World Heritage Sites, and with the communities that live in and around them and depend upon them.

IUCN's view of the importance of civil society involvement has been on the record over many years, and was discussed most recently at the once-in-a-decade IUCN World Parks Congress, held in November 2014 in Sydney, Australia. World Heritage was a high profile cross-cutting theme, and a series of proposals were agreed as part of the "Promise of Sydney", the outcome document from the Parks Congress.

I would like to take this opportunity to convey a number of key messages from the World Heritage components of the Promise of Sydney:

"The World Heritage Convention is of central importance in recognizing protected areas of universal value to all of humanity. World Heritage Sites protect over 8 % of the total global protected area estate, including our most iconic natural and cultural areas, and should be drivers of change and models of excellence to show how protected areas can succeed as inspiring solutions for nature and people.

"The promise of World Heritage sites is to provide the highest level of international protection to our most iconic protected areas, and to provide exemplary leadership within the protected areas movement on land and in the oceans. Delivering the promise of World Heritage is the litmus test, as allowing these sites to be degraded would constitute a clear failure of the conservation movement.

"Despite their iconic status and global recognition, World Heritage sites are subject to the same threats and pressures facing the wider protected area estate: they are suffering from the impacts of climate change and are increasingly under pressure from large scale development projects, including a range of very damaging industrial extractive activities. In order to change the dynamic for World Heritage, all stakeholders and rights holders have to act together, making the conservation of these outstanding places a global, joint common responsibility between State Parties, private sector and industry (including extractives), civil society, local communities and indigenous peoples. To be successful we need to commit to World Heritage as a common purpose." The full version of this important document is available online, and on request from IUCN.

The IUCN World Parks Congress 2014 looked at the current status of the World Heritage Convention, and the key issues. Amongst these it noted that civil society support for the Convention has seen a recent and welcome increase. This is manifested in the number of regional and global NGO networks emerging to support the Convention and its work, strengthened support for individual World Heritage sites, both in terms of site management support as well as advocacy, and increased civil society presence at World Heritage Committee meetings.

World Heritage Watch is the clearest example of this reality. But we consider that the scale of this engagement is still too limited and fragile. The future of the World Heritage Convention will rely on much wider engagement and support from civil society, as well as indigenous peoples, local communities and religious groups. Civil society needs to be recognized as a full actor in the way the World Heritage Convention functions.

IUCN strives to represent all viewpoints, but for many issues the voices of affected communities and the organisations working on the ground need to be heard directly by the Committee in order for issues to be fully understood.

The IUCN World Parks Congress 2014 set an agenda for change over the next decade, and with the following six key points that need attention:

Firstly, the World Parks Congress called on States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to work with civil society and other partners to ensure that World Heritage sites serve as models for integrated, effective, equitable and enduring natural and cultural conservation, and have a good and improving outlook and resilience in the face of global change, as a litmus test of the success of Protected Areas globally. Thus the message that civil society should be central to World Heritage is central, and the responsibility of the Convention's States Parties is clear.

Secondly, there is a need for targeted nomination of sites that fill the few remaining gaps on the World Heritage List in terms of conserving biodiversity, wilderness, spectacular natural features, cultural landscapes, and geodiversity, in all regions of the globe. The World Heritage Committee should maintain the high standard of Outstanding Universal Value to ensure only those areas that are the best of the best are inscribed on the World Heritage List. Civil society has a crucial partnership role and potential to assist here. Whilst we can and do assist, IUCN cannot prepare the nominations that we later evaluate, and civil society organisations have both the reach and the freedom to support States Parties directly on ideas for new nominations – provided these respect the required standards for World Heritage listing. IUCN will be pleased to advise on ideas World Heritage Watch and its members may have in this regard.

Thirdly, the credibility and integrity of the World Heritage Convention must be restored and retained, and decision-taking by the World Heritage Committee should be driven by science and objectivity. A tendency to politicization of World Heritage processes, sometimes against the founding spirit of the Convention, has been widely noted. Whilst IUCN speaks frequently on these concerns, we consider that more voices are needed, especially from civil society, to call for the Convention to maintain the high standards that are the foundation of its reputation, and which we cannot afford to lose.

Fourthly, the Parks Congress made a specific call to civil society, local communities, indigenous peoples and religious groups to decisively increase their engagement in the World Heritage Convention in support of World Heritage sites and the communities that depend on them, demonstrating that these exceptional places contribute to sustainable development and the eradication of poverty, and should contribute to the forthcoming United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Thus I would wish to convey that we need the members of World Heritage Watch to all stand up and do what you can to support listed sites, and the World Heritage Convention as a whole. This is a shared responsibility.

Fifthly, and a crucial credibility issue, global standards for indigenous peoples rights, including the UN Declaration on Rights of

Indigenous Peoples, should be adopted and implemented in the World Heritage Convention. This should include a revision of its Operational Guidelines to ensure respect for the rights of indigenous peoples, and the full and effective involvement of indigenous peoples, local communities and religious groups in the Convention's evaluation and monitoring processes and in the management of World Heritage sites on indigenous peoples' lands, territories and seas, in accordance with a rights-based approach. Here is the clearest issue where the voices of civil society should be heard directly. We believe that indigenous peoples need to be fully included in the Convention and the Committee meetings, and represent their views directly in the debates when needed. It is welcome that World Heritage Watch is reaching out to include indigenous peoples representatives at this meeting.

Finally, the Congress focused on the links between nature and culture, and called on the World Heritage Convention to fully and consistently recognize indigenous peoples' cultural values as universal, and develop methods to recognize and support the interconnectedness of natural, cultural, social, and spiritual significance of World Heritage sites, including natural and cultural sites and cultural landscapes. IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM are working increasingly together to build and reconnect our work to ensure that the intimate links between nature and culture are respected, both in view of their inseparable connection being central to World Heritage nominations requested by indigenous peoples, and because more widely the Convention should innovate and set an example for the consideration of both nature and culture given its unique focus on both. We have not taken these opportunities through much of the history of the Convention, and civil society should challenge and support these connections to be made.

Allow me to close with an announcement and an invitation. At the World Parks Congress, we launched the IUCN World Heritage Outlook. This first global assessment of all natural World Heritage sites sets a new approach to the Convention to secure success across all listed sites. Every site was assessed and given one of four ratings: Good, Good with Concerns, Significant Concern or Critical. We will be repeating the assessment every three years, and tracking progress. But this is not a system just for monitoring, we want it to be a way to both gather the best information on World Heritage sites, and diagnose the needs for them to secure a good outlook and help secure the support that is needed.

I would like to announce that IUCN will be launching this year a call for "Outlook Partners" who will join us in both contributing information to the IUCN World Heritage Outlook, and taking action to support World Heritage sites when they need it. We look forward to connecting with World Heritage Watch, and all of its members, to make this new vision for World Heritage a reality.

The Rights of Indigenous Peoples in the World Heritage Convention

Max Ooft, Vereniging van Inheemse Dorpshoofden in Suriname (VIDS)¹

Distinguished participants of this important conference on World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society, I convey to you the warm greetings of my chiefs and peoples in Suriname, and thank the conference organizers for this unique opportunity to say a few words to so many important people. My name is Max Ooft, from the Kali'na people of Suriname and Policy Officer in the Bureau of the Association of Indigenous Village Leaders in Suriname, VIDS by its acronym in Dutch, which is the official language of Suriname. VIDS is our traditional authority structure, composed of the chiefs or "captains" of all indigenous villages of the country. For the chiefs, who live in all parts of Suriname, a country more than 4 times the size of the Netherlands and covered for over 90% with forests, without roads in the interior, it is of course difficult to effectively coordinate daily work. So in 2001 the board of VIDS established a coordinating technical and administrative office in the capital Paramaribo, namely Bureau VIDS. That is where I work as Policy Officer, together with five other indigenous staff.

The work of VIDS deals mostly with our struggle for legal recognition of our land rights and of our traditional authorities, for example demarcation of our territories, drafting concept legislation, advocacy during stakeholder workshops, protests against mining and other concessions or protected areas in our traditional lands. In addition, our chiefs deal with their own village or they support other villages, particularly in governance matters or conflicts with government or intruding private companies. Every single day we get complaints from villages from all over the country of again another breach of our rights, which are not recognized in any law in Suriname, as if it were not enough that we often do not have clean water and only limited development opportunities in our villages. A mining concession, a highway being built through a village, preparations to establish a protected area, research for medicinal plants, our forests being negotiated with polluters as collateral for deals of which we will not see the benefits, etc.

¹

And obviously we ask ourselves, why? Can anyone just walk into our lands and take everything what they want and say that we don't have rights? Are we not equal? Do we not count when people say that they act in the national interest and for the devel-

opment of the country, or for global commitments? Does national interest mean "the interest of everyone except the Amerindians"? Why do we always have to suffer from, and are sacrificed to development? Why are we not recognized as protectors and custodians of the lands and resources we have managed for generations and instead, conservation is forcibly handed to others? Why do we hear that expansion of the international airport, which would mean the forced removal of two indigenous villages, is necessary for the country to live up to its international commitments and for security standards, but the international commitments to human rights and indigenous peoples' rights are apparently not equally important? These villages would have to move for a second time for the same international airport which was used during the Second World War to supply aluminum to the Allies, again leaving behind their forests, crops and creeks.

I didn't come here to whine about the situation in our villages in Suriname. But I mention all this to make it hopefully clear that there is a direct and sometimes very painful connection between what happens at international level and how we are treated as indigenous peoples, and how defenseless we often are. To provide that specific perspective of World Heritage and civil society. Because also in World Heritage matters we are often forgotten, marginalized and even harmed. At best we are treated as some other stakeholder or NGO from civil society whereas we are *peoples*, with self-determination and internationally recognized collective rights.

Various important international organizations and donor countries are financing or otherwise supporting these violations of our rights and making our lives miserable, leaving our communities without certainty for their survival and future. The donors say that they don't interfere in national matters because that is national sovereignty. They say there are international standards, but then fail to enforce them or even to respect them. I was present at the 37th Session of the World Heritage Committee to make proposals for adaptations to the Operational Guidelines, and some of the very same countries that approved the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in the UN General Assembly in 2007, were fiercely opposed to mentioning anything concrete on indigenous peoples in the World Heritage guidelines. Again, everything else

¹ Association of Indigenous Peoples in Suriname

was more important. And countries that are otherwise sympathetic to indigenous peoples' rights, just listened to those hostile comments and didn't stand up.

On the other hand, international standards *can* have great benefits for local communities, if the international community and actors at national level are willing to really implement and enforce them. And a respectful, rights-based approach to world heritage *can* have great benefits for indigenous peoples; those examples also exist where indigenous peoples are proudly involved in the designation and management of world heritage sites, and where we work in a mutually respectful manner with governments, civil society organizations and international organizations.

We understand the challenges of international law and international relations. It does not change overnight, and there must be consensus. But the changes that *can* be made, should be made or at least initiated without delays, if the international organizations, donors and other actors are sincere in saying that they want to respect human rights standards, justice for all, and other standards of good governance, equality, freedom, dignity and non-discrimination. An International Expert Workshop on the World Heritage Convention and Indigenous Peoples was held in Denmark in 2012, where many disturbing examples were presented on how the actions arising from commitments under the World Heritage Convention impact on indigenous peoples. The case studies are available in that workshop report, and dealt with a variety of fundamental concerns, among others about:

- Problems arising from the differentiation between cultural heritage and natural heritage
- Lack of regulations to ensure meaningful participation and free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples in the nomination and designation of World Heritage sites
- Frequent lack of consideration of indigenous peoples' rights during the nomination and inscription process
- Frequent lack of consideration and recognition of indigenous cultural heritage in nomination documents
- Significant lack of transparency in some of the Convention's processes
- Inadequate involvement of indigenous peoples in the management of many World Heritage sites
- Restrictions and prohibitions on indigenous land-use activities in some World Heritage sites (sometimes directly related to the World Heritage status)
- Inadequate benefit-sharing with indigenous peoples in many World Heritage sites
- Frequent lack of consultation of indigenous peoples in the evaluation and monitoring of sites
- Difficulties in bringing concerns effectively to the attention of the World Heritage Committee
- Lack of concerted action to redress past and ongoing violations of indigenous peoples' rights in World Heritage sites.

All these issues have also been recognized and discussed by, among others, the UN Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.

These UN bodies, as well as the African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights, the IUCN World Conservation Congress and other organizations that don't close their eyes to what is happening, and of course the affected indigenous peoples themselves, have called on UNESCO and on the World Heritage Convention bodies to make changes and put in place policies and safeguards to prevent continuing peoples' and human rights' violations. Because that's what happening in some sites today.

To end, I would like to ask the consideration of this forum, and inclusion in relevant resolutions, for the main recommendations of the aforementioned expert workshop. All matters that I have mentioned here are well documented and have been submitted to UNESCO and the World Heritage Convention bodies, and are publicly available.

1. That the World Heritage Committee urgently establish an open and transparent process to elaborate, with the direct, full and effective participation of indigenous peoples, changes to the current procedures and Operational Guidelines and other appropriate measures to ensure that the implementation of the World Heritage Convention is consistent with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and a human rights-based approach. Such changes should affirm and guarantee, among others, the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples, consistent with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, prior to any tentative listing or inscription of a World Heritage site incorporating or affecting their lands, territories or resources; and recognition of indigenous peoples as rights-holders and not merely stakeholders. The newly proposed Policy on integrating a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention which mentions the free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) and equitable and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities is a welcome step in that direction, but it needs to be translated into effective operational guidelines that create real obligations to respect rights in the implementation of the Convention, in order to have a practical effect. Similarly, the currently proposed revisions of the guidelines related to FPIC to be discussed next week, are rather weak and are only "encouraging" States Parties to "prepare nominations with the widest possible participation of stakeholders and to demonstrate that their free, prior and informed consent has been obtained, through, inter alia making the nominations publically available in appropriate languages and public consultations and hearings". We all know that "encouraging" means almost nothing in practice;
2. That the World Heritage Committee will not inscribe any further sites that incorporate or affect indigenous peoples' lands, territories or resources on the World Heritage List without proof or evidence that the free, prior and informed consent of the Indigenous peoples concerned has been obtained;

3. That the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO urgently establish the necessary procedures to improve transparency and accountability in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, including in the identification, monitoring and management of World Heritage sites and in the processing of World Heritage nominations. Such procedures should include, inter alia, that World Heritage nominations are made publicly available as soon as they are received by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre;
4. That the World Heritage Committee establish, with the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and through an open and transparent process, an advisory mechanism consisting of indigenous experts, to assist in the implementation of measures to ensure that all actions related to the World Heritage Convention uphold the rights of Indigenous peoples;
5. That States, UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee provide sufficient financial and other resources to enable the World Heritage Centre to effectively support and advance the full realization of the provisions of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in all matters concerning the World Heritage Convention;
6. That the World Heritage Committee issue a standing invitation and provide support to the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues to participate in its sessions and provide sufficient speaking time to the Permanent Forum to effectively contribute to its sessions;
7. That States and the World Heritage Committee urgently respond to and redress conditions within existing World Heritage sites where human rights violations or conflicts continue to affect indigenous peoples;
8. That the World Heritage Committee request the Advisory Bodies to include experts on indigenous peoples' rights on their World Heritage Panels and as desk reviewers of all nominations affecting indigenous peoples.
9. That States ensure the equitable and effective participation of indigenous peoples in the administration and management of World Heritage sites within indigenous peoples' lands and territories and support indigenous peoples' own initiatives to develop administration and management systems;
10. That States ensure that the benefits arising from the use of indigenous peoples' lands, territories and resources as World Heritage sites are defined by and genuinely accrue to the indigenous peoples concerned, in a fair and equitable manner;
11. That States, UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee provide sufficient financial resources to support the full realization of the rights of indigenous peoples in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and the measures outlined in the Call for Action.

I wish all participants much success in their deliberations and hope to see clear results coming forth from this conference. Thank you very much.

II. Contributions of NGOs to the Safeguarding of the World Heritage



Natural Heritage NGOs

Moderator: Dr. Maritta von Bieberstein Koch-Weser
(Earth 3000)

Threats to Russian Natural World Heritage Properties from Development Projects

Mikhail Kreindlin and Andrey Petrov, Greenpeace Russia

Ten sites in the Russian Federation are inscribed on the honorable World Natural Heritage List. Unfortunately, exactly half of them are under various threats of destruction. Among them are:

- “Lake Baikal”, threatened by the construction of hydropower stations on the Selenga River and its tributaries in Mongolia, development of polymetallic ore mines at the Kholodnenskoye deposit, and problems of the utilization of accumulated wastes from the Baikal Pulp and Paper Mill.
- “Western Caucasus”, under threat of mountain ski resort construction on the Lagonaki Plateau and underway construction of the Lunnaya Polyana government residence, wood cuttings inside the Upper Streams of Pshekha and Pshekhaskha Rivers Natural Monument and planned development of recreational infrastructure inside the Caucasus Nature Reserve
- “Virgin Komi Forests”, “Golden Mountains of Altai” and “The Natural Complex of Wrangel Island Reserve”. These three are in the most terrible situation and, arguably, must be inscribed onto the List of World Heritage in Danger on the upcoming 39th Session of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee.

This paper focuses on the three properties listed in the last bullet point.

1. The Virgin Komi Forests

The Gold Minerals Company, whose authorized capital belongs to four Cypriot companies, plans to start mining for gold at the Chudnoye deposit inside Yugyd Va National Park that is a part of the World Heritage property. There is a settlement for workers within the deposit territory and a constant presence of heavy construction equipment. In 2011-2012, geological prospecting works (including drilling and blasting) took place there (Fig. 1). As a result, the natural complexes, especially water objects, suffered considerable damage (Fig. 2).

The Russian authorities have taken active steps to legalize such activities and to exclude this particular plot of land from the Yugyd Va National Park boundaries. In 2009, the Ministry of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation, in the interest of the Gold Minerals Company, ordered a land management survey that inferred a supposedly “excessive area”, which coincidentally turned out to be exactly the area of the Chudnoye deposit. The “excessive area” was not found at the edge of the park, but exactly in the middle of its Northern part.

Fig 1. Rig and prospecting trench at Chudnoye deposit, 2012. (below)



Fig 2. Grubependity Lake wasted as a result of blast-hole drilling works, 2012. (right)

Photos: Mikhail Kreindlin/Greenpeace

In 2010, the Ministry of Natural Resources of Russia issued a new policy called the "Regulations of the National Park" where the Chudnoye deposit is no longer located inside the park territory. This decision was deemed illegal by the General Prosecutor's Office and was confirmed by the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation. Despite this, the Ministry adopted the new regulations which excluded the territory of the Chudnoye deposit from the National Park. In addition, these regulations allow the use of transport for those users of land plots located inside the boundaries of the National Park, giving the Gold Minerals Company's technology and equipment the opportunity to move legally inside the park through outside roads and specially allocated places. These regulations were also ruled as illegal by the Supreme Court, but the Gold Minerals Company and Russian authorities continue to try to organize gold-mining on this territory, and they continue to prepare documents for the removal of the above-mentioned territory from the National Park complex.

In addition to this, on the territory of Pechoro-Ilychsky Nature Biosphere Reserve, which is also a part of this World Heritage property, uncontrolled tourism has been getting worse in recent years, specifically at the Manpupuner Plateau. Visiting the plateau by tourists was permitted by the reserve administration in 2012 in violation of Russian law.

On April 15, 2015 the Ministry of Natural Resources filed a supervisory appeal to the Supreme Court Decision, dated October 01, 2014.

It is also necessary to note that areas proposed for inclusion in the boundaries of the World Heritage property in accordance with the new nomination presented in January 2015 still do not have any protected status. They are neither included into the boundaries of the Yugyd Va National Park nor in the boundaries of any other protected area.

Thus the State Party of the Russian Federation continues activities directed at changing the legal status of an area inside the boundaries of the World Heritage property (withdrawal of "Chudnoye" deposit from the park complex) and is contributing to the destruction of the Outstanding Universal Value. These actions make the site eligible for inscription onto the World Heritage in Danger List according to Article 180 of the 2013 Operational Guidelines to the Convention.

2. The Golden Mountains of Altai

The "Golden Mountains of Altai" are facing similar issues due to construction proposals of a pipeline through the site. The Gazprom Company plans to build the Altai Gas Pipeline to China via the territory of the Ukok Quiet Zone Nature Park which is a part of the Golden Mountains of Altai World Heritage property (Fig. 3). In November 2014, Russia and China signed a memorandum about gas delivery via the so-called "Western Route" (the shared border West of Mongolia). The head of the Chinese National People's Congress (CNPC) and Russian authorities officially confirmed that




Fig 3. Map of Ukok Quiet Zone Nature Park with the route of the planned gas pipeline.

Photo: Greenpeace

the Memorandum is about a gas pipeline to be constructed directly through the World Heritage property. Besides the pipeline, the suggestion for tripling the pipeline, construction of a motorway, and the possibility of a railroad are being considered.

After a visit to Beijing on February 13, 2015, the head of Gazprom, Alexey Miller, announced that the project of a gas pipeline for delivery of Russian gas to China via the Western Route is ready and about to begin construction (Fig. 4). Commercial negotiations



Fig. 4. Machinery conducting project and prospecting works on Ukok Plateau in summer 2012.

Photo: Alexey Gribkov/Greenpeace

moved with high velocity. On May 8, 2015, the Gazprom Company and the CNPC Oil and Gas Corporation signed an agreement about the main conditions for gas delivery to China using this route.

Among these conditions, the location where the gas pipeline will cross the Russian-Chinese border has been defined.

On the Russian side, the pipeline will cross the border at the Kanas Pass. This pass is located on the Ukok Plateau which is a part of the World Heritage property. Therefore, Russia and China have made a final decision about the construction of the Altai Gas Pipeline via the Ukok Quite Zone Nature Park, which is a part of the Golden Mountains of Altai World Heritage property.

In general, the path of this pipeline will travel through an environmentally sensitive area (Fig. 5). The Ukok Plateau, including the




Fig. 5. Route of the vessel "Neptunia" in the oil concession waters near Wrangel Island, Spring-Autumn 2014. Map: Greenpeace

Kanas Pass, is the habitat of several globally rare species like the Snow Leopard. In the case of the gas pipeline construction, some of this habitat will be destroyed. That means that the recent decisions to build will lead to a serious disturbance of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Thus, China and Russia, which are both parties to the UNESCO Convention Concerning Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, are in violation of the agreement according to Article 4 (Russia) and Article 6 (China).

3. Natural Complex of Wrangel Island Reserve

In August 2014, construction of military objects began on the territory of Wrangel Island Nature Reserve. In September 2014, within the framework of a military training called "East-2014", the landing of airborne army troops and navy units took place. The military conducted a training battle on the territory of the nature reserve. In November 2014, mass media reported that the construction of a military settlement on the island had been finished and the operation of the radar station had begun.

In autumn 2014, the movement of vessels in the waters of the reserve sharply intensified. In addition to vessels transporting military cargo, there were tankers and vessels, chartered by Rosneft, found in the waters of the reserve conducting seismic surveys. The vessels were seen in the water areas named "North Wrangel-1" and "South Chukchi", as well as in the waters of the East Siberian and Chukchi seas adjacent to the boundary of the buffer zone of the reserve (Fig. 6).




Fig. 6. Estimation of possible oil spill during oil drilling by Shell Company (Environmental Impact Assessment). Map: Greenpeace

The creation of a military base which provides year-round housing to a considerable number of military personnel on the island, and the conduction of military trainings and training battles has already begun. Additionally, there is active movement of industrial vessels in the waters of the nature reserve. These actions will inevitably lead to serious damage of the island's ecosystems. It is the opinion of specialists that any action connected with polar bear disturbance (even actions such as environmental tourism) could have a considerable influence on the population of bears on Wrangel Island. The fact that the population of polar bears is now endangered was accepted by the President of Russia, however these military constructions are still taking place.

The information about the potential danger to the reserve came from Shell Oil Company which itself intends to start research works for drilling in the Chukchi Sea not far from the property (Fig. 6).

In connection with the above, we appeal to the World Heritage Committee with the proposal to amend Draft Decisions of the 39th Session in order to inscribe the "Virgin Komi Forests", the "Golden Mountains of Altai" and the "Natural Complex of the Wrangel Island Reserve" onto the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Extractives Industry and Natural World Heritage Sites: A Review of the Issues

Dr. Noëlle Kümpel, Zoological Society of London

With contributions from Yolande Kyngdon-McKay, James Wingard, Liz Clarke, Vivi Bolin, Surshti Patel, Abra Kaiser, Sophie Grange, Susanne Schmitt, Alasdair Davies

Background

UNESCO natural World Heritage sites (WHSs)¹ are recognised as being of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) to humanity and are the flagships of the global network of protected areas. However, despite covering less than 1% of the globe's surface, they are increasingly under threat from myriad industrial-scale activities, in particular extractive (mining, oil and gas) activities. We summarise




Fig. 1: Virunga NP is special to the ZSL for the okapi, or forest giraffe which was first described at a meeting of the Society in 1901. Over 100 years later, ZSL reconfirmed its presence in the area, capturing the first ever photos of the species in the wild by camera trap, and is now coordinating efforts to conserve the species across its range.

Photo: Zoological Society of London

here the key findings and recommendations from a detailed investigation into the reasons for these increasing threats, carried out by the Zoological Society of London (ZSL) in collaboration with Estelle Levin Ltd and Legal Atlas Inc.²

The study included a review of regulatory frameworks, a survey of extractives and finance sector company policies and perspectives, and evaluation of spatial monitoring and environmental risks at international and site level, focusing on three marine and terrestrial case study WHSs: the Great Barrier Reef (Australia), Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of Congo) and Dja Faunal Reserve

(Cameroon) (Fig. 1). This presentation outlines the key messages and recommendations for multiple stakeholders, including States Parties to the World Heritage (WH) Convention, the WH Committee, the finance and extractives sectors, standard-setting bodies and civil society.

Results

Firstly, State Party signatories to the WH Convention often allocate concessions and/or allow extractives activities within natural WHSs despite the WH Committee's long-held position that they are incompatible with WH status. As a consequence, these sites are under increasing threat from the direct, indirect and cumulative environmental impacts of extractives activities, which have the capacity to affect their OUV (Fig. 2).

Secondly, the domestic adoption of the WH Convention legal framework by States Parties — necessary where the treaty is not directly enforceable or requires clarification — is often weakly or opaquely worded, and is far from uniform across States Parties, which creates opportunities for extractives companies to access



Fig. 2: Cumulative average number of extractive threats per nWHS since pre-1996 and percentage of nWHSs affected by extractives since 1985.

Chart: Zoological Society of London

¹ This includes 'mixed' WHSs, which are listed for both natural and cultural values.

² Kyngdon-McKay et al. in prep. The extractives industry and natural World Heritage sites: a review of the issues. Zoological Society of London (ZSL), London, UK.

properties that the spirit of the relevant law/s arguably intends them not to. The efficacy of such laws is also often further undermined by the inability of some States Parties to adequately monitor extractives activities, both industrial and artisanal and small-scale (ASM), and implement relevant legislative requirements. These failings are further compounded by the inability of the WH Committee to enforce adherence to the Convention; compliance with the Convention is effectively voluntary, and the delisting process – the only real recourse available to the Committee to promote compliance – is seldom used, indeed, only once in the 43-year history of the Convention, as it carries considerable reputational risk to both the State Party and company/ies involved.



Fig. 3: Intervention by Dr. Dr. Noëlle Kümpel on behalf of the Zoological Society of London on the 39th Session of the WH Committee in Bonn, 29 June 2015.
Photo: Zoological Society of London

Thirdly, although there has been progress in the private sector in relation to the adoption of public ‘no-go’³ (and ‘no-impact’⁴) commitments for WHSs, little momentum has been gained in their uptake since their emergence in 2003. Furthermore, the wording of many protected area policies in the extractives and finance sectors is highly variable (and not always public), and approval for projects can sometimes rely on subjective assessments of ‘tolerable’ harm levels to WHSs – features that neither promote consistency in the conservation of these sites nor recognise their inherent biodiversity value. The lack of specific no-go wording for natural WHSs in accepted international frameworks, standards and guidelines, such as those developed by the International Finance Corporation (IFC), development banks or commodity-based standards, further disincentivises such private sector initiatives.

Fourthly, inadequate cooperation and communication between stakeholders has led to a situation of ‘passing the buck’, whereby companies cite governance or regulatory issues as a barrier to private sector-specific initiatives, or civil society lays the blame for encroachment on WHSs with the private sector alone. Without universal acceptance of no-go frameworks, companies lacking stringent environmental policies are more likely to enter natural WHSs in place of those with more environmentally responsible policies in place.

3 A ‘no-go’ policy refers here to the commitment by a company to not carry out or support extractives activities in a particular site.

4 A ‘no-impact’ policy refers here to the commitment by a company to not carry out or support extractives activities that may have adverse impacts on a particular site, regardless of the location of the activity.

Finally, data on the scale and incidence of extractives activities within and in close proximity to natural WHSs are incomplete and difficult to access. Similarly, relevant biodiversity data is not always easy for the private sector to find or access. This undermines efforts to accurately monitor and manage these activities and assess their environmental impacts, which in turn challenges the development of appropriate institutional, policy and private sector responses.

Recommendations

In light of these findings, we make several key recommendations (summarised by stakeholder group in the table below):

1. **Strong, consistent and operational national legal frameworks.** States Parties to the WH Convention are encouraged to respect current and future WHS boundaries and cancel all existing mining, oil and gas concessions that overlap natural WHSs and to not allocate such concessions in future. Additionally, they are encouraged to include in national legislation (1) an ‘off-limits’⁵ provision for industrial-scale extractives activities (including associated infrastructure) within all natural WHSs and (2) a stipulation that appropriate and rigorous pre-emptive appraisal processes, such as international best practice environmental and social impact assessments (ESIAs), must be undertaken for extractives activities that may affect natural WHSs. The WH Committee is encouraged to consider including clear guidance on these provisions, as already outlined in previous Decisions, in the new Policy Guidelines to the WH Convention currently under development. Legal experts could provide relevant reviews, tools and advice to support these activities.
2. **Standardised private sector policies.** The finance and extractives sectors, and those involved in the trade and purchase of extractives resources, are encouraged to develop standardised, industry-wide ‘no-go’ and ‘no-impact’ principles for industrial-scale extractives activities (including associated infrastructure) for all natural WHSs, and collaborate to develop an improved regulatory framework to oblige universal adherence. In the meantime, the extractives sector could improve site selection methodologies to promote the avoidance of natural WHSs (the Energy Biodiversity Initiative’s (EBI) standards could be used as a basis for these guidelines).
3. **Integration into international standards.** The IFC is encouraged to modify or provide sector-specific guidance for Performance Standard 6 (PS6), and development banks such as the World Bank are urged to develop appropriate safeguards, to require their clients to avoid natural WHSs. Voluntary certification schemes should include similar standards. This would help to standardise this practice globally in both the public and private sectors.
4. **Multi-stakeholder cooperation and support.** UNESCO and the WH Committee are encouraged to support the efforts of

5 An ‘off-limits’ provision refers to a government restriction on development in a particular site, rather than corporate policy.

WH civil society networks to assist States Parties (and the Advisory Bodies) with the monitoring, management and reporting of their natural WHSs. The extractives, procurement and finance sectors are encouraged to work with the conservation sector to engage with the WH Convention to improve the regulatory framework and thus support private sector initiatives.

5. **Data sharing and transparency.** Industry and governments are urged to share policies and laws on WHSs and non-commercially sensitive data collected during strategic planning and environmental risk assessment stages of project development,

to enable better spatial mapping of extractives activities and to support efforts to improve transparency on threats to and impacts on WHSs. Donors such as the development banks should fund improved efforts to make biodiversity data, such as that collated for National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and National Red Lists, publicly available and relevant to WHSs, to facilitate the execution of appropriate ESIA.

6. **Recommendations for different stakeholders to safeguard natural and mixed WHSs from industrial-scale extractives activities**

Stakeholder	Recommendation
States Parties to the WH Convention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect the boundaries of World Heritage sites as designated • Cancel all existing mining, oil and gas concessions that overlap natural WHSs and do not allocate such concessions in future • Include in national legislation (1) an 'off-limits' provision for industrial-scale extractives activities (including associated infrastructure) within all natural WHSs and (2) a stipulation that appropriate and rigorous pre-emptive appraisal processes, such as international best practice ESIA, must be undertaken for extractives activities that may affect natural WHSs • Encourage the WH Committee to detail the WH Convention's position on extractives and natural WHSs in its new Policy Guidelines • Share non-commercially sensitive data collected during strategic planning and environmental risk assessment stages of project development to support transparency and best practice • Support improved efforts to make biodiversity data, such as that collated for National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and National Red Lists, publicly available
WH Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider including in the WH Convention's Policy Guidelines clear guidance on the above provisions for State Party national legislation • Support the efforts of WH civil society networks to assist States Parties (and the Advisory Bodies) with the monitoring, management and reporting of their natural WHSs
IFC, development banks, certification and other standard-setting bodies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop appropriate safeguards and standards to require their clients to avoid natural WHSs and ensure no negative impacts from activities outside them • Fund improved efforts to make biodiversity data, such as that collated for National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and National Red Lists, publicly available
Extractives sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop standardised, industry-wide 'no-go' and 'no-impact' principles for industrial-scale extractives activities (including associated infrastructure) for all natural WHSs (existing and future) • Improve site selection methodologies to promote avoidance of WHSs • Work with the conservation sector to engage with the WH Convention to improve the regulatory framework on extractives and natural WHSs • Share data collected during strategic planning and environmental risk assessment stages of project development, to enable better spatial mapping of extractives activities and improve transparency
Procurement and finance sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop standardised, industry-wide 'no-go' and 'no-impact' principles for industrial-scale extractives activities (including associated infrastructure) for all natural WHSs (existing and future) • Work with the conservation sector to engage with the WH Convention to improve the regulatory framework on extractives and natural WHSs • Support efforts to improve transparency on threats to and impacts on natural WHSs
Conservation sector and civil society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work through WH civil society networks to assist States Parties (and the Advisory Bodies) with the monitoring, management and reporting of their natural WHSs and to raise issues regarding their protection • Conduct a full review of national/local interpretation and implementation of WH-related legal frameworks for all WHSs and States Parties to the WH Convention and make publicly available, to help guide legislative revision • Work with industry and other civil society groups to engage with the WH Convention to improve the regulatory framework on extractives and natural WHSs • Provide technical support for IUCN's World Heritage Outlook system to improve monitoring and management of natural WHSs

The Living Lakes Network and Natural World Heritage: Experiences and Conclusions

Marion Hammerl, Global Nature Fund

The Global Nature Fund is an international, private, charitable foundation (NGO) founded in 1998 and based in Germany. Our activities include:

- Realization and coordination of projects for the protection of nature and the environment, with a special focus on water resources and aquatic ecosystems
- Development of model projects for the promotion of sustainable economy
- Motivating companies and other economic actors to reduce impact on biodiversity through an initiative called Business and Biodiversity
- Exchanging information, experiences and joint activities with other NGOs worldwide through the Living Lakes Network

The International Living Lakes Network

The International Living Lakes Network was created in 1999 by four organisations representing four lakes. Today, the network has grown to 104 member organizations (mainly NGOs) representing 102 lakes and wetlands worldwide.



Living Lakes is an international network and partnership whose mission is to enhance the protection, restoration and rehabilitation of lakes, wetlands, other

freshwater bodies of the world and catchment areas. Our vision is that all lakes, wetlands and freshwater bodies of the world should be healthy ecosystems and that any human use should be sustainable and not damaging to the environment.

The main objectives of the network are:

- Conserving and restoring lake and wetland ecosystems and their biodiversity
- Building commitment towards sustainable use of natural resources and ecological and socially responsible development of lake regions
- Promoting the use of applied science and technology for conservation

- Offering educational programs and cooperation with local communities
- Improving the quality of life for local communities
- Disseminating information regarding the situation of lakes and wetlands and the value of their ecosystem services for our livelihood
- Providing a platform for NGOs to exchange information and experiences, and to develop their joint activities

There are six Living Lakes declared as Natural World Heritage sites:

- Lake Baikal in Buryatia, Russia
- Lake St. Lucia in South Africa
- Lake Bogoria in Kenya
- Pantanal in Brazil, Bolivia and Paraguay
- Okavango Delta in Botswana
- Lake Tengis in Kazakhstan

Currently, none of the Living Lakes partners are actively involved in the management or the activities realized in the framework of the Natural World Heritage status.

Two Examples Regarding the Impact of the World Heritage Status

1. Lake St. Lucia, iSimangaliso Wetland Park (South Africa)

The iSimangaliso Wetland Park became part of the Living Lakes Network in 1999. It includes coral reefs, long sandy beaches, extensive coastal dunes, estuarine and freshwater lakes, inland dry savannah, woodlands and wetlands of international importance. These environments provide critical habitats for a wide range of wetland, ocean and savannah species.)

A special law adopted for iSimangaliso, the World Heritage Convention Act, provides a legislative framework for iSimangaliso's protection, conservation and presentation. However, mining permits are a constant issue; every year there are mining requests from the Richards Bay Minerals Company along the St. Lucia dunes

for titanium and other minerals. The St. Lucia dunes are the highest forested dunes in the world covered and they have a very complex hydrological system. Experience shows that it is not possible to restore these fragile ecosystems after mining!



Fig. 1: Location of iSimangaliso Wetland Park. Map: African Natural Heritage

Our Living Lakes partners “Wildlands Conservation Trust” and the “Wilderness Foundation” have confirmed the general estimation from IUCN regarding the ecological situation of St. Lucia Lake. Because of the involvement of NGOs and Community-Based Organisations (CBO)

including the Wildlands Conservation Trust, there are lesser threats from water pollution. This has happened mainly through established consultation processes and concrete projects.

For many years, the Wildlands Conservation Trust has organized,



Fig. 2: Savannah landscape in the interior of iSimangaliso Wetland Park. Photo: Wildlands Conservation Trust

with others, the “Trees for Life” Project to encourage “tree-preneuers” to grow native species. The Wildlands Conservation Trust buys the trees at a fair price and supports the elimination of invasive species and the reforestation with native trees and bushes.

However, Lake St. Lucia is suffering significant threats from:



Fig. 3: Rhinoceroses in iSimangaliso Wetland Park.

- constantly increasing poaching activities (e.g. Rhino poaching),
- the increasing up-stream commercial forestry, which affects the groundwater of the region,
- the transformation of the upper Mfolozi Swamps through agricultural activities, resulting in damage of the hydrology and salinity of the wetland system, including the reduction in water supply, and
- the impacts of climate change where severe droughts are affecting the largest catchment area of the entire system, the Mfolozi catchment.

2. The Pantanal Wetlands (Brazil, Bolivia, Paraguay)

The Pantanal Wetlands were added to the Living Lakes Network in 2000. Covering a region of 140,000 sq. km, the Pantanal is the world’s largest wetland. It is characterized by tropical forests, savannahs, rivers, lakes and swamps. During the rainy season, the Paraguay River and its tributaries inundate large areas of the wetlands. In the dry season, the region turns into a savannah, shimmering with heat.

The biodiversity of the region is extremely rich. There are 260 species of fish and 650 species of birds in the area. For example, one can find Spectacled Cayman, Hyacinth Macaw (*Anodorhynchus hyacinthus*), Rhea (*R. americana*), Giant River Otter (*Ptenorura brasiliensis*), Tapir (*Tapirus terrestris*) and Jaguar (*Panthera onca palustris*), all of which are native species found in the Pantanal.

In 2007, GNF declared the Pantanal Wetland as the Living Lakes Threatened Lake of the Year. Threats to the wetland include deforestation, monoculture farming, intensive cattle ranching and gold and diamond mining. The construction of new ethanol distilleries will increase the already critical situation, which could lead to the ecological devastation of the world’s largest wetland by 2050.

The threats and causes responsible for the dramatic destruction of the Pantanal have been known for many years; deforestation, monoculture farming and intensive cattle ranching are responsible for dramatic changes of the landscape and the hydrological regime of the Pantanal. Soy and sugar cane plantations have already created vast waste areas which were formerly forested savannahs (known as *Cerrado*) with rich biodiversity. Soy production in Brazil is expanding fast,



Fig. 4: Tracking of Rhinoceroses. Photos: Global Nature Fund

which can be attributed to its use as a forage crop and as biofuel. Brazil is the world’s second largest soy producer with 50 million tons a year. Brazil is also the second largest producer of ethanol fuel, and until 2010 has been

the world's largest exporter. In order to remain competitive, the government authorized the construction of new ethanol distilleries in the Pantanal in 2007. Another negative effect comes from upstream hydropower developments, which may lead to ecolog-



Fig. 6: The Pantanal in springtime.

Photo: Michael Sutor/GNF



Fig. 7: Cayman butterfly on a Yacare Cayman.

Photo: Guenter Ziesler/GNF

ical devastation by 2050. Additionally, gold and diamond mining can contaminate ecological systems because of the use of heavy metals and chemicals such as cyanide, sulphuric acid, and other organic chemicals.

Conclusions

While positive impacts of the World Heritage Status (WHS) can be observed at the St. Lucia Lake, there are no positive impacts in the Pantanal Wetlands thus far.

Positive experiences with the World Heritage Status:

- An increase in public awareness
- Governments are required to develop an integrated management plan for the lake and catchment area
- The WHS strengthens protection policies and provides arguments and a legal basis against unsustainable development plans and projects. However, this is only if a specific legislation is in place, as in the case of St. Lucia Lake where the World Heritage Convention Act provides a legislative framework for iSimangaliso's protection, conservation and presentation. Without such specific legislation, the protection status is very weak.
- WHS contributes to increased tourism development (although not all of the tourism activities are sustainable. For example, the carrying capacity of the site has been neither evaluated nor respected).

Urgent need for improvements:

- Most of the Living Lakes with WHS suffer the same severe problems as lakes that do not have this status. It is advised that the World Heritage Committee evaluate the impacts of the WHS and identify the gaps of the conservation status. This evaluation would also provide valuable information about the aspects which contribute an increased efficiency of the WHS as a conservation status.
- Many authorities managing WH Sites do not take climate change impacts into consideration and should therefore modify their management plans. All ecosystems, especially lakes and wetlands, are suffering severe impacts from climate change. WH site management plans should include a sound analysis of those impacts and should specify appropriate climate change adaptation measures.
- Gaps between the objectives and actions of management plans and real-life scenarios need to be addressed more seriously and more often. Monitoring results of WH site management plans should be public and accessible for stakeholder groups. Like all sound management systems, stakeholders should be involved in monitoring developments at WH Sites.
- The activities related to WH Sites in the Living Lake Network are mostly overseen by government agencies. There is an important lack of transparency, lack of monitoring and very limited participation of NGOs.
- Stronger and continuing involvement of NGOs is needed, and the following aspects should be guaranteed:
 1. Access to relevant information for stakeholders
 2. A formal structure ensuring sound participation of NGOs in the development of WH Sites
 3. The enabling of local NGOs to participate actively (e.g., through financial support).



Fig. 5: Location of the Pantanal National Park.

Map: National Geographic

WWF's Engagement in Natural World Heritage Sites – A Global Overview

Uli Frank Gräbener and Günter Mitlacher, WWF Germany




Fig. 2: WWF's 35 global priority regions – these are the areas where the network focusses its activities.

Map: WWF

The Galápagos National Park was one of the first field sites that the "World Wildlife Fund" (today: Worldwide Fund for Nature, WWF) became active in shortly after it was founded in 1963. Over the years, WWF has helped the Ecuadorean government establish the Galápagos National Park, control introduced species that threaten the islands' rare indigenous plants and animals, develop a marine



Fig. 1: Marine Iguana (*Amblyrhynchus cristatus*), the only sea-going lizard in the world, sunbathing in the Galapagos World Heritage site, Ecuador. Photo: Martin Harvey / WWF

reserve, and set up research training and education programs. WWF also supported the Galapagos Islands' initial nomination for inscription as a World Heritage natural site in 1978 and the site's enlargement in 2001; and later with fulfilling the requirements under the nomination. Today, the Galapagos Islands can be seen as an excellent example of integrating strong conservation and research with environmentally friendly tourism (Fig. 1).

This was only the starting point of WWF's involvement in the conservation of natural World Heritage sites globally. It goes without saying that WWF's mission statement – "For a living planet!" – includes the preservation of those natural sites that the World Heritage Convention identified as having outstanding universal value.

Though WWF does not have a program that exclusively focuses on natural World Heritage sites, the work is integrated into several regional programs defined by WWF's global programme framework (Fig. 2). Examples of this work are provided in the table below.

Examples of WWF's engagement in natural World Heritage sites globally:

World Heritage Sites (inscription year)	Country	WWF's Engagement
Africa		
Sangha Trinational Park (2012)	CR/CF/CD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing sustainable development alternatives
Salonga National Park (1984)	DR Congo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring proper park management / protection • reducing illegal hunting and bush meat trade • providing sustainable development alternatives
Virunga National Park (1979)	DR Congo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting long-term sustainable development
Kahuzi-Biega Nat. Park (1980)	DR Congo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reducing poaching and human encroachment
Selous Game Reserve (1982)	Tanzania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preventing poaching / illegal killing of elephants • promoting conservation-based activities in local communities
Rainforests of Atsinanana (2007)	Madagascar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • conducting biodiversity assessments • supporting jobs and income generation (eco-tourism) facilitating maintenance of ecosystem services
Asia, Australia & Pacific		
Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (1985)	India	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting elephant, tiger & rhino conservation • resolving human-wildlife conflict
Western Ghats (2012)	India	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • conducting species surveys and monitoring • securing critical corridors, community engagement • supporting anti-poaching activities
Chitwan National Park (1993)	Nepal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strengthening ranger capacity and equipment • wetland mapping and restoration • conducting climate change impact monitoring
Lorentz National Park (1999)	Indonesia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting collaborative management • revising district spatial plans
Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (2004)	Indonesia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • halting encroachment & illegal logging (park & surrounding) • decreasing wildlife poaching • establishing eco-friendly livelihoods
Great Barrier Reef (1981)	Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improving conservation practices and management • supporting the reduction of water pollution • campaigning to ban dredging and industrialisation
Shark Bay (1991)	Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improving habitat protection in key seagrass areas • campaigning to reduce coastal development • campaigning to ban pesticides
Europe & Russian Far East		
Wadden Sea National Parks (2009)	Netherlands, Germany, Denmark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • campaigning against expansion of oil exploration • supporting environmental sustainable fishery practices • facilitating adaptation to sea rise

World Heritage Sites (inscription year)	Country	WWF's Engagement
Doñana National Park (1994)	Spain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting introduction of integrated water management • relocation of farms
Danube Delta (1993)	Romania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • realizing an integrated ecological network of wetlands • promoting sustainable socio-economic development
Białowieża Forest (1979)	Poland, Belarus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improving protection of the old-growth, primeval forests • promoting sustainable tourism for local communities
Golden Mountains of Altai (1998)	Russia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting the effectiveness of protected areas • developing sustainable financing strategies
Uvs Nuur Basin (2003)	Russia / Mongolia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • developing partnerships with local communities • conducting species monitoring & anti-poaching activities • strengthening network of protected areas
Central Sikhote-Alin (2001)	Russia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting tiger conservation (protection, monitoring, community engagement, law enforcement) • mitigating poaching and illegal trade
America		
Central Amazon Conservation Complex (2000)	Brazil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting consolidation / expansion of protected areas • promoting responsible use of natural resources • elaborating standards for infrastructure development • building capacity and scientific knowledge
Pantanal Conservation Area (2000)	Brazil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting protected areas establishment & management • developing good environmental livestock practices
Atlantic Forest (1999)	Brazil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting the establishment of protected areas & private reserves • supporting landscape planning & landscape restoration
Cerrado (2001)	Brazil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting implementation of protected areas • promoting good environmental agricultural practices
Galapagos (1978)	Ecuador	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promoting conservation and research • developing sustainable tourism
Monarch Butterfly BR (2008)	Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • implementing reforestation • monitoring butterfly populations • water management, stakeholder coordination, • forest monitoring & forest fire management

WWF's work in these sites includes a variety of activities, including:

- Supporting inscription in the World Heritage list,
- Providing technical equipment,
- Improving law enforcement (i.e. anti-poaching, illegal logging, etc.),
- Co-managing protected areas,
- Advocating for better conservation,
- Raising awareness through international campaigns.

As a global conservation organisation, WWF works „local to global“. The organisation is locally active with concrete support for sites, regionally and nationally active in ensuring frameworks are in place to support sites' conservation, and globally active through international campaigns for severely threatened sites.

The following examples illustrate this approach:

1. **Virunga National Park:** Virunga National Park has been under threat for many years mainly due to the local demand for bush meat, charcoal, and other natural resources. WWF has provided support to improve law enforcement in the park and introduced alternative cooking systems to reduce the demand for charcoal. This local support was no longer enough when in 2013, Soco – a UK oil company - announced plans to drill for oil within the park's boundaries. Together with other NGOs, WWF organised a global campaign that succeeded in Soco committing to withdraw from the Virunga National Park in 2014 (Fig. 3).




Fig. 3: WWF's Virunga campaign: "Draw the line".

Photo: Brent Stirton / Getty Images / WWF

2. **Great Barrier Reef:** Though WWF Australia has supported the Great Barrier Reef's conservation for many years, it continues to deteriorate from year to year. The main threats to the reef are significant increases in dredging and shipping, the continuous development and industrialisation of Australia's north-eastern coast, and water pollution from agriculture. In 2014, the WWF network started a global campaign aimed at preventing large international banks from financing huge harbour infrastructure near the reef. The campaign was intensified directly prior to the 39th World Heritage Committee meeting, which took a strong decision forcing the Australian government to take bolder actions to protect the reef (Fig. 4).



Fig. 4: The successful WWF campaign at Deutsche Bank. The bank later withdrew its interest in funding a coal harbour at the Great Barrier Reef.

Photo: WWF

3. **Brazil:** WWF has been active in Brazil for many years, working both locally and nationally to establish a representative protected areas network. However, the Brazilian government is currently discussing new legislation on mining as well as changes to its constitution, which would have severe negative impacts on protected areas and natural World Heritage sites. This would dramatically weaken the status of protected areas and make mining possible within the boundaries of World Heritage sites (mining permission requests have already been submitted). WWF will launch a global campaign in 2015 to ensure that these policies will not become reality and that the integrity of protected areas and the World Heritage sites in the Brazilian Amazon are secured.

Since 2014, WWF has been an official partner of UNESCO under Art XI (4) of UNESCO's Constitution. This partnership is currently agreed upon for six years. This gives WWF an outstanding position to better advocate for a strong World Heritage Convention and for improved conservation of natural World Heritage sites. WWF will continue to lobby in countries with natural World Heritage sites to stop ecosystem degradation and avoid impacts from infrastructure, mining, water pollution and other causes. Campaigning and raising awareness on the outstanding universal value of natural World Heritage sites remains an important pillar of WWF's work.

Comparing Threats and Management Interventions in 20 Natural World Heritage Sites

Matthew Hatchwell, Charlotte Schep and Susan Lieberman, Wildlife Conservation Society

Introduction

The World Heritage Convention confers an invaluable, additional level of protection on the 232 natural and mixed natural/cultural properties worldwide that have been inscribed on the World Heritage list in recognition of their Outstanding Universal Value to humankind, over and above the safeguards provided by national legislation. As part of UNESCO’s monitoring function, assessments of the State of Conservation of World Heritage properties are carried out on a reactive basis under the framework of the Convention – annually for sites whose Outstanding Universal Value has been identified as being under particular threat (“Sites in Danger”) and at the request of the World Heritage Committee for others. UNESCO also conducts Periodic Reporting of WH sites on a six-year cycle, the results of which it was not possible to include in this study. In 2014, IUCN as the official Advisory Body to the World Heritage Convention on natural WH sites launched World Heritage Outlook, a more systematic global assessment of the status of all natural World Heritage sites and the actions needed to achieve excellence in their conservation.

The global network of land- and seascapes where the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) operates overlaps with 28 natural and mixed World Heritage sites, including eight Sites in Danger, as well as at least four cultural WH sites. In 2013-14, WCS mobilised over \$14m




Figure 1: Combined threats for WCS WH sites reported by SoC, WHO and WCS assessments

in support of the protection and management of just 20 of those sites. The purpose of the present study was to conduct an independent assessment of the threats facing the 28 natural and mixed properties where WCS works, drawing on internal expertise and experience, and to compare the results to those of the threat assessments carried out under the State of Conservation (SoC) and World Heritage Outlook (WHO) frameworks. In order to minimise the time required by field staff to complete the survey and to maximise the number of responses, a short online questionnaire was developed consisting of eight questions, the main two of which asked respondents to rank a) the threats confronting the sites where they are working, and b) the effectiveness of the management interventions that are being applied.

In order to protect the anonymity of individual sites, results of the WCS survey were aggregated for the purpose of comparison with publicly available data from the UNESCO SoC reports and IUCN WHO. A comparative analysis of responses from WCS sites was carried out against SoC and WHO data for the same set of sites. While WHO data were available for all WCS sites, SoC reports (which are compiled reactively, and go back in one case to 1993) were available for just 23 out of the 28 sites. Since the taxonomies of threats and management interventions underlying the SoC and

WHO assessments differed significantly, an alternative taxonomy developed by the Conservation Measures Partnership (CMP 20) was used for the WCS study in order to maximise comparability with the other two data sets.

Twenty responses were received to the survey of WCS programmes working at natural and mixed WH sites. The nature of WCS’s programmes in and around natural WH properties in North America meant that it was not possible to complete the questionnaire for most sites. Those sites (n=6) were therefore omitted from the analysis. In Africa, WCS is present in 22 percent of natural and mixed WH properties; in Asia, seven percent; and in Latin America and the Caribbean, 18 percent. Globally, WCS is working in 40 percent of natural WH Sites in Danger (eight out of 20). Comparability between data sets was assured by restricting the analysis to SoC, WHO and WCS data for the 20 sites that responded to the survey.

Threats Analysis

The top five threats cited by the SoC, WHO and WCS threat assessments across the 20 natural WH sites where WCS works and that responded to the questionnaire were:

	State of Conservation Reports	World Heritage Outlook	WCS
1	Illegal activities	Commercial hunting	Commercial hunting
2	Management systems / management plans	Invasive /alien invasive species	Illegal activities
3	Mining	Roads/railways	Indigenous / subsistence hunting
4	Ground transport infrastructure	Impacts of tourism / visitors / recreation	Land conversion
5	Invasive /alien terrestrial species	Crops (annual/perennial non-timber crops)	Logging and wood-harvesting

Although there are obvious similarities across the three analyses, there are also significant differences, such as the broad focus of WCS responses on threats relating to natural resource use. Other threats that rank highly in both the SoC and WHO assessments – alien invasive species and ground transport infrastructure, for example – were ranked much lower by WCS respondents. While it is impossible to say on the basis of this study which assessment most accurately reflects the situation on the ground, it is clear that one or more factors, perhaps relating to the differing threat taxonomies employed or to the selection of respondents in the three studies, led to different results across the three reporting processes.

Combining the results of the three threat assessments into a single, meta-analysis, eliminates the differences between them by presenting the threats cumulatively (Fig. 1). Once the SoC, WHO and WCS data are conflated, the top five threats to the 20 focal natural WH sites are: 1) commercial hunting, 2) roads and railroads

/ ground transport infrastructure, 3) illegal activities, 4) mining and quarrying, and 5) war, civil unrest and military exercises.

Commercial hunting stands out as the greatest threat to natural WH sites even though it does not figure in the SoC taxonomy. SoC respondents did however cite “illegal activities” as the main threat to their sites, which is likely to overlap in many cases with commercial hunting. It is recommended that future surveys distinguish more clearly between legal and illegal hunting. Other major threats relate to the effects of war and civil unrest, which are likely to exacerbate other pressures, and to the impacts of economic growth. Combining the responses for “land conversion” under the SoC and WCS surveys with that for “crops” under the WHO study results in agricultural expansion rising up the analysis to become the second highest threat.

A separate cumulative analysis of the threats confronting the eight natural World Heritage Sites in Danger where WCS is working

Effectiveness of protection & management technique (1 to 5 = most to least effective)




Figure 2: Effectiveness of Protection and Management technique: WCS assessment

indicates that the greatest threats are similar to those for other natural WH sites, except that oil and gas extraction moves up from 14th to fourth or fifth place depending on whether crops and land conversion are conflated as a single threat as discussed in the previous paragraph.

Analysis of Protection and Management Interventions

Besides the threats assessment, the survey of WCS sites included two questions about the effectiveness of protection and management interventions. Because no comparable data were available from the UNESCO State of Conservation reports, the taxonomy of actions used for IUCN’s World Heritage Outlook assessment in 2014 was used for the WCS survey as well. Research and law enforcement were cited by WCS programmes (Fig. 2) as the most effective actions at WH sites, with engagement with local communities flagged as a priority at all sites along with the development of tourism and interpretation programmes.

The equivalent WHO data (Fig. 3) are much less clear. While sites also highlighted research as being an effective form of management action, their answers to the WHO survey are more strongly

clustered around a neutral response, with the result that the differences between the most and least effective actions are less pronounced. Actions relating to tourism and interpretation emerged from the WHO survey as being the most effective, with staff training and relationships with local communities among the least effective.

In order to differentiate between the effectiveness of management interventions at a) field and b) policy levels, an additional analysis was carried out that separated management interventions into field-based actions, policy actions, and mixed field-policy actions. Responses to the WCS survey suggest that, in general, field-level actions are more effective than policy-level ones. To the extent that any such trend is clear from the WHO data, the suggestion is that policy and mixed field-policy interventions are more effective. As with the threats analysis, further work would be required to ascertain whether the results of one survey better reflect the reality of the situation than the other, or whether the divergent responses are due to differences between sets of respondents.

For future studies, further work may also be useful on the wording of questions relating to the effectiveness of management interventions and to relate management actions to specific threats. A supplementary question in the WCS survey, which had no equiva-




Figure 3: Effectiveness of Protection and Management Actions: WHO Assessment

lent in the SoC and WHO surveys, asked respondents to rank the actions most important to tackle comprehensively the threats at their sites, and elicited a somewhat different response to the question about management effectiveness. In particular, research was given a much lower ranking, suggesting that the formulation of the first question may have led some respondents to score actions on the basis of successful implementation rather than effectiveness in addressing threats.

Conclusions

While the three data sets included in the comparative threats assessment – SoC, WHO and WCS – reflect significantly different responses from field sites to their respective questionnaires, a cumulative analysis of the data helps to reduce variations between the three surveys caused by the different taxonomies of threats employed and, possibly, by the different sets of respondents. From those cumulative data, commercial-scale hunting and the broader impacts of economic growth – the expansion of road and rail networks, land conversion for agriculture, and mineral, oil and gas extraction – emerge as major threats across all three surveys at

the 20 natural WH properties in the study, along with the impacts of war and civil unrest.

While the strong emphasis by respondents to the WCS survey on law enforcement and working with local communities indicates a deliberate (and successful) management response to the threat of commercial hunting, the WHO results may reflect a stronger focus on actions to manage the effects of macro-economic growth on the 20 natural WH sites in the study. Both are vital, and need to be strengthened in order to prevent more properties from joining the list in danger – and to help those already on it to move back into good standing. It may be useful for future surveys to relate management actions more directly to specific threats, for example through linked (or linkable) taxonomies of threats and actions.

References

CMP Threats and Actions Classification v 2.0, see <http://cmp-openstandards.org/using-os/tools/classification-beta-v-2-0>.



Cultural Heritage NGOs

Moderator: Prof. Dr. Mounir Bouchenaki
(Arab Regional Center for World Heritage)

The World Monuments Fund: A Philanthropic Response to International Heritage Needs

Lisa Ackerman, World Monuments Fund¹

The World Monuments Fund (WMF), created in 1965 to address international heritage conservation needs, emphasizes the marriage of private philanthropy, local engagement, and professional expertise. World Heritage sites have figured prominently in the life of WMF. In the 1960s and 1970s WMF responded to the aftermath of the floods in Venice, safeguarded the cultural landscape of Easter Island, and conserved the rock-hewn churches of Lalibela. All three of these locations were later inscribed on the World Heritage list, and WMF had ongoing activities at all three sites over the decades. WMF remains committed to inspiring concern for the rich cultural heritage that provides economic, educational and spiritual benefit to local communities and international travelers. While WMF does not have a special mandate to work at World Heritage sites, its activities in the field are always a mixture of places inscribed on the World Heritage list, heritage sites on the tentative lists of many countries, and locations that are of local or national significance, which may or may not one day be on the World Heritage list. Interestingly, a review of WMF's activities from 1972 to the present day indicates that WMF has been engaged in heritage conservation activities at more than 80 World Heritage sites and has committed approximately \$60 million toward work that ranges from condition assessments, planning, conservation, site management, and training.

WMF currently has active projects in more than 35 countries. Included in these activities are WMF projects at Angkor, Cambodia; Ayutthaya, Thailand; Babylon, Iraq; and the Mughal Riverfront Gardens in Agra, India. These sites are emblematic of the complexities of addressing conservation and social needs. Angkor is inscribed on the World Heritage list and has benefitted enormously from UNESCO's International Coordinating Committee for the Safeguarding and Development of the Historic Site of Angkor. Through UNESCO's ICC-Angkor, financial support, training, international standards for documentation, conservation and interpretation, and ongoing evaluation of the work in the archaeological park have been brought to this important site. WMF's work at

Angkor is presented regularly at ICC-Angkor meetings, and the international convening fosters a dialogue between the various teams working at Angkor, which might not be achieved without this mechanism.

WMF works actively with UNESCO, ICOMOS, local heritage authorities and local communities to determine effective approaches to steward these important sites. Increasingly local engagement and public communication are vital to assure that decision-makers understand that these sites represent more than the physical materials that gave rise to their creation. They are portals to understanding history, communicating heritage values, and supporting the needs of communities.

As a US-based not-for-profit agency, WMF must raise funds each year to support its efforts. The organization has been fortunate to develop a strong base of donors who are captivated by the field of international heritage conservation. In recent years, we have also benefitted from support through the US Department of State's Ambassadors Fund for Cultural Preservation. The majority of WMF's support come from US private individuals and foundations.

Two transformative moments in the life of the organization occurred in the 1990s, just after the 30th anniversary of World Monuments Fund. The first was the launch of the World Monuments Watch, an advocacy program that continues today. This program issues a list of sites every two years that brings attention to heritage around the world that is endangered and emblematic of the dramatic pressures facing heritage sites today. The sites have ranged widely over the years and cut across time from the earliest settlements to the architecture of the 20th century; highlight masterpieces of cultural and artistic achievement and extraordinary examples of vernacular architecture; they have also illustrated themes that have emerged through the Watch such as heritage in conflict, modernism at risk, pressures of development, lack of resources, and changing landscapes and cityscapes.

The second act that transformed the organization was the commitment to WMF of funding from a major philanthropist that contributed \$100 million to WMF through the Robert W. Wilson Challenge to Conserve Our Heritage. This program ran for approx-

¹ This contribution was actually not presented on the conference because the author was prevented at the last minute. However, since the contribution was prepared and was part of the conference program, we would like to provide the opportunity to read it here.

imately 15 years and allowed WMF to work across the globe and on a broader and deeper scale than was previously possible. WMF needed to secure non-US matching funds to access these funds, but through the Wilson Challenge it was possible to support 201 projects in 51 countries. As a result of the matching requirements, WMF's funds combined with the non-US contributions totaled more than \$250 million invested in these conservation projects.

The theme of this conference addresses the ways in which civil society organizations engage with and benefit World Heritage sites. There are thousands of philanthropic agencies around the world that contribute to the betterment of World Heritage sites and the communities that surround them. WMF does not differentiate its work by virtue of whether a place is on the World Heritage list, but without question the organization is one of the many agencies assisting these sites. To illustrate the way in which WMF further its goals and contributes to World Heritage sites, its work at Angkor provides an example of effective partnership with APSARA National Authority and coordination with UNESCO through the framework of the ICC-Angkor.

Angkor was inscribed on the World Heritage list in 1992 and there have been 16 State of Conservation reports since that date. UNESCO has invested considerable funds at Angkor and has built capacity through its support of APSARA National Authority. Dozens of international partners have worked with APSARA over the years. Universities, foreign ministries, and NGOs have committed resources to the protection of heritage, natural resources, and the communities living within the archaeological park. WMF is proud to be one of the many organizations that has worked closely with Cambodian and international colleagues to develop conservation programs, train professionals, and implement work to an international standard. WMF undertook its first mission to Cambodia in 1989 and soon thereafter launched a training and documentation program at Preah Khan, one of the temple sites within Angkor. The goal was to train a cadre of Cambodians to document the site and work with the international team to develop a conservation strategy (Fig. 1). In the aftermath of the Khmer Rouge period, Cambodia faced many challenges. While the site was not harmed directly by the Khmer Rouge, as they took Angkor as a symbol, the site was neglected and looting was rampant. The country was also one of the most heavily mined ever and, even today, land mines and unexploded ordinance are found throughout the country.

The training program was a success and in the early 1990s, a conservation program was launched at Preah Khan that strove to treat

the site as a stabilized ruin and make it safe for visitors to traverse the site and marvel at the intricate carvings and sense of space of a complex that once served as a monastic complex. The Cambodian team's skills advanced and the group at the end of the 1990s took



Fig. 1: WMF's Project Team at Angkor in 1991.

Photo: John Stubbs / WMF

on the challenge of designing and implementing a conservation program for Ta Som, another temple at Angkor. In the mid-2000s, WMF launched two projects at Angkor that truly demonstrated the tremendous skills gained by the Cambodian team. One was the conservation of the roof over the Churning of the Sea of Milk Gallery at Angkor Wat, which houses one of the most famous bas-reliefs at Angkor (Fig. 2). Water infiltration was damaging the bas-relief, and the conservation program involved the deconstruction of the roof to find the source of the problem, clean all the



Fig. 2: Roof conservation on the Churning of the Sea of Milk Gallery, 2009

Photo: WMF

stones, and return them to the roof safely with improved mechanisms for shedding water and directing it away from the wall that contains the bas-relief. As with many conservation projects, one



Fig. 3: Hall of Dancers, Preah Khan Temple.

Photo: Ken Feisel / WMF

of the great discoveries of the project was evidence of the original passive Khmer drainage system. A goal of the project was to capitalize on the ancient method of controlling water run-off and improving the conditions of the roof to add an additional layer of defense to protect the site.

among dozens at Angkor, it is evident that UNESCO and others have made considerable strides in safeguarding Angkor and advancing local capacity.

Today Angkor is a tremendous economic force for Cambodia, with



Fig. 4: Tourist crowds at Phnom Bakheng Temple, Angkor.

Photo: Ken Feisel / WMF

In this same period WMF initiated a project at Phnom Bakheng, the oldest monument at Angkor (Fig. 3). This work continues today. The result of this unbroken investment at Angkor is that WMF currently employs more than 100 Cambodians full-time, year-round

more than 2 million tourists a year (Fig. 4). The site's management has improved dramatically over the years. There are improvements needed, as is the case at every site around the world. For WMF, the best evidence of the value of the investment through civic engagement is the benefits to the local population. Angkor's heritage conservation programs, tourism management needs, and ongoing safeguarding provide jobs and skills training, engender economic investment regionally, and provides a stabilizing influence on the local community.

Only time will tell if the World Heritage Convention and civil society agencies meet our expectations for what should be achieved. At the very least, we know that since 1972 there have been earnest and sustained efforts to advance these goals.

in the conservation programs in which it is engaged at Angkor. They work as architects, engineers, surveyors, draftsmen, and site workers. The work benefits a World Heritage site, but it also directly benefits the community, as the majority of the workers live in villages within Angkor. From 1989 to 2015, WMF has expended \$8 million on its work at Angkor. The majority of these funds have been expended in Cambodia through employment, procurement of materials, equipment, research and documentation. These numbers are small in comparison to the sums reported by development agencies, but when one considers that WMF is only one actor

The Global Heritage Fund's Perspective on World Heritage

Stefaan Poortman, Global Heritage Fund

Overview of the Global Heritage Fund (GHF) and its programs and activities

Founded in 2002, GHF is a U.S.-based non-profit conservancy focused on the sustainable preservation of World Heritage sites (inscribed or tentative) in developing regions around the world. To-date, GHF has raised over \$30M from individuals, foundations, corporations and governments, and another \$30M+ in-country co-funding for 20 projects in 16 countries such as Peru, Turkey and Cambodia.

GHF employs a scalable and replicable methodology we call *Preservation by Design* with four dynamic components:

- a) **PLANNING:** GHF Planning can involve risk assessments, conservation planning, management planning, and socio-economic baseline assessments. Many of these plans are fundamental components of UNESCO's World Heritage nomination dossiers.
- b) **CONSERVATION:** Our Conservation employs the latest in technology, material science, conservation practices, training and interpretation. GHF works with local communities to ensure knowledge transfer and capacity-building for long-term preservation. GHF and our experts follow operational guidelines of the World Heritage Convention and guidance from principle charters including the Venice and Burra Charters. Many of our experts, especially members of our technical review and advisory board, are ICOMOS members.
- c) **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:** For preservation projects to be successful, it is imperative to address the root social and economic factors that frame human relationships with cultural heritage sites. GHF believes it is necessary to create win-win opportunities for sites and local communities. Effective and sustainable preservation of cultural assets requires a strategy that makes preservation economically beneficial to local stakeholders and empowers them to become stewards of these assets over the long term. To ensure sustainability of cultural heritage assets, it is necessary to define a strategy that involves all stakeholders, from the

local, national, regional and international communities, in a manner that is participatory and transparent.

- d) **STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS:** Given our mandate and status, GHF is able to partner and collaborate with a wide range of organizations including with international institutions, national, regional and local governments, the private sector, and civil society, including local communities.

Example of a GHF – UNESCO partnership in Pingyao, China

GHF first explored the possibility of collaboration with the UNESCO Beijing Office in 2010, where one of their cultural heritage officers was invited as an expert to review the Pingyao Master Conservation Plan prepared by Shanghai Tongji University, and jointly funded by Pingyao County government and GHF. Issues and challenges regarding conservation of the historic Pingyao walled city were discussed during this meeting and thereafter the UNESCO Beijing Office reached out to GHF with the idea of collaborating, along with other partnership, including Pingyao Municipality, Shanghai Tongji University, and China Cultural Heritage Founda-




Fig. 1: Conservation Management Guidelines for the town of Pingyao.

Photo: Global Heritage Fund

tion on a bilingual traditional courtyard house repair and maintenance guideline. A formal collaborative agreement was established in 2011 to create two volumes of the guidelines – a Conservation Management Guidelines targeted for authorities and professionals (Fig. 1), and a Conservation Practical Guidelines designed mainly for residents and lay persons. The latter will complement the existing regulations at the local, provincial and national levels.

Various drafts were prepared and revised per comments by relevant experts and stakeholders, culminating a review meeting in 2013 in Beijing, where national experts in cultural heritage conservation were gathered to assess the guidelines. In June 2014, the first volume, the conservation management guidelines, was officially launched in Pingyao, followed by a one-day workshop attended by professionals and officials from heritage departments in Pingyao and other parts of Shanxi Province. The second volume, the conservation practical guidelines, is due to be released in December 2015.

The collaboration between UNESCO and GHF proved to be mutually beneficial in various ways. UNESCO Beijing Office acted as the main project coordinator, exercising their influence and authority over heritage matters to motivate local government and consultants to come together. The dissemination and resultant impact of the guidelines amongst heritage professionals and governmental authorities in China is largely heightened under their managerial involvement. On the other hand, GHF acted not only as a donor to UNESCO providing financial support, but was also a technical partner involved in the management and production of the guidelines. In addition, GHF's years of practical engagement in conservation activities in Pingyao proved extremely helpful to UNESCO to inform and facilitate the development of the guidelines in a professional capacity.

The role civil society could play in the conservation and management of WHS

- First of all, it is important to recognize how diverse Civil Society is – CS comprises NGOs, foundations, associations, academia, social enterprises, unions, etc. There are many players and many interests. While we in this room are representatives of CS, we are also experts. We need to be aware of the distance that can exist between professionals and active citizens.
- In the same vein, a local community is rarely homogenous. It is imperative to talk about 'communities' not 'community' and to ensure that everyone has a voice. Local communities are stratified. As we heard in our Sites session yesterday afternoon, how do we ensure the most disenfranchised also have a voice and that we are not just serving the interests of the local elite? In Northern Guatemala, GHF's Mirador Project created a multi-sectorial roundtable that met monthly and where all the stakeholders have a voice and come together to discuss perspectives at the same table – from the loggers, various gateway communities, environmental stakeholders and local, regional and national government.

- In the past two years, overnight visitors to remote Banteay Chhmar in Cambodia have doubled, and income for villagers has almost tripled, thanks to the Banteay Chhmar Community-Based Tourism (CBT) project, supported by GHF. There are just nine homestays in the village, offering 30 rooms, which translates to a capacity of 25 to 50 visitors a night. A total of 70 villagers are currently involved in the CBT in different ways, providing transport, cooking meals, working as guides, operating ox-cart rides, and performances of classical Khmer music (Fig. 2). Training of participants in everything from English to hygiene, and coordination of transport, accommodation, meals and activities is managed by the 15 volunteer committee members from the village. A roster system is used so the opportunities and income are distributed fairly among those involved.



Fig. 2: Tat Sophal, foreground, head of the Community-Based Tourism Center at Banteay Chhmar, Cambodia.

Photo: Craig Stennett / Global Heritage Fund

- Participants in the program earn money from visitor fees, while a percentage goes into a village fund that has financed initiatives such as site preservation, garbage collection and cleaning of the moat. Donations from visitors have also paid for a restaurant and children's library.
- The lack of representation of indigenous peoples is another strong case in point. GHF has a project at Ciudad Perdida in the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta in Colombia where the local indigenous communities are opposed to WH nomination. They feel it will bring mass tourism and further cultural intrusion into their fragile communities. GHF actually worked with the Colombian government to fund and conduct a carrying-capacity assessment to determine the maximum level of annual visitation that will not negatively impact the natural and cultural heritage of the region (Fig. 3).



Fig. 3: Ciudad Perdida, Colombia.

How can UNESCO advisory bodies better their system? How can NGOs work within the system?

- **Access** – In order for CS to play its role in conservation and management, it needs the “tools” to do so. First, it needs access to all relevant information. There can be no accountability without data transparency. How is this data delivered? Can there be one focal point with relevant objectives, plans and data? This means that essential project data need to be accessible – in terms of appropriate technology and in a format that is understandable to local communities. Second, there is an essential need for local communities' capacity to be built and strengthened to ensure bottom-up participation. In other words, communities need training on how to understand the data and relate it to their circumstances. This is easily “forgotten” resulting in communities being marginalized in the process.
- **Coordination and Communication** – How do we formalize the relationship between UNESCO and CS? How do we identify and track the relevant actors? Mapping and inventorying of civil society entities in developing regions, such as the Middle East and North Africa, could facilitate contacts, encourage the exchange of information and experience, enable organisations to link up with similar organisations elsewhere, and find project partners. New technologies can support civil society for the better protection and recovery of cultural heritage. These cost and time effective tools can be applied by concerned and trained citizens for the protection and documentation of cultural heritage, and carrying out impact assessments in the aftermath of disasters.

- Given our mandate and flexibility, GHF can efficiently seed community-based conservation activities. GHF not only helps with international funding, but also seeks to catalyze in-country co-funding in an effort to build national private sector associations for heritage. In the US, we have the National Trust for Historic Preservation – in Turkey and Peru there is no national, private-sector organization focused on sustainable preservation of Peruvian Heritage.

To conclude, in the relatively short experience of GHF, we have studied the dynamics of world heritage systems and on the whole approve the activities undertaken. We are of the opinion that much more work should be done upstream in the preparation for World Heritage Site nominations. This would establish ‘preparedness’ at all levels of a site's capacity. The site itself and steps towards its conservation should be well planned, and the proposed activities should be achieved by local experts, advised by international experts, who together will raise the capacity of the design team and also the preparedness of civil society for managing, monitoring and preserving the site after inscription is achieved.

Photo: Global Heritage Fund

Towards a Global Civil Society Alliance for Heritage

Sneška Quaedvlieg-Mihailović, Europa Nostra

First of all, I wish to congratulate Stephan Dömpke and his small but very dedicated team. Your task was not easy, but thanks to your perseverance and hard work you have managed to bring together representatives of heritage NGOs and encourage us to raise our voice and share our concerns on the eve of this year's Annual Meeting of the World Heritage Committee.

Whether we come from NGOs committed to conservation of natural heritage or cultural heritage, we feel united by a common cause: the need to strengthen the voice of civil society within the process of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. We should however keep in mind that our cause goes beyond the good governance of the World Heritage Convention; we are all dedicated to promote - more generally - the key role of civil society for the good governance of our heritage. Over the years, establishing and promoting a structured dialogue with civil society have indeed become a vital pillar of "good governance" for all public authorities (international, European, national, regional and local). Time has therefore come that such a dialogue is set up and duly incorporated in the process of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

We all know that civil society organisations – many of which are represented here in Bonn – play already, in different ways, a very important role on the ground: as advocates, as managers, as communicators or as educators. Most of those civil society organisations cooperate already – more or less harmoniously – with public authorities, at local, regional or national level. But what we currently miss is some kind of a formal recognition, a public expression of appreciation of that role at the level of the UNESCO Institutions, both at the level of its Member States – through the World Heritage Committee; and at the level of its Secretariat – through the World Heritage Centre. If and when this is achieved, UNESCO would be able to assert its leadership and spread its vision, both at global level and at national level, especially in those countries which still have a weak tradition of civil society engagement in the heritage field.

Europa Nostra has a long experience of building a structured dialogue with the European Union. It took us 20 years until we finally managed to have an open, regular and structured dialogue with

the European Commission, and only a beginning of a dialogue with the Council of Ministers. Consequently, last year was a year of significant policy developments related to cultural heritage at the level of the EU, including a full recognition of the importance of the so-called "participatory governance of cultural heritage". Civil society organisations are increasingly perceived as essential players since they help the European Union to bridge the gap between its institutions and the citizens and to fully engage citizens in the implementation of its various policies.

In order to achieve this structured dialogue with EU institutions, we in Europa Nostra have had to prove our credibility, to come with good arguments, and to convince the politicians and civil servants that we are their allies and not enemies. We have had to demonstrate that we seek to serve public interest and not specific partial interests.

What can be learnt from Europa Nostra's experience of dialogue with the European Union? We need to be patient and persistent; and we need to make an effort to unite our action. The creation of the European Heritage Alliance 3.3. in 2011 (for more information, see www.europeanheritagealliance.eu) constituted indeed an important step forward. This Alliance provided an informal platform for pooling forces and resources among 33 European or international networks active in the wider field of heritage. In 2012, we produced together an ambitious position paper calling for an "EU strategy for cultural heritage". Two years later the European Commission adopted a major policy document, the Communication "Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage in Europe"¹. The time was evidently ripe for action; but the joint action by such a large number of European networks certainly prompted the European Commission to take action.

I also wish to mention an important result of cooperation at European level between different heritage partners: the "Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe" Report which was recently produced by 6 partners coordinated by Europa Nostra and which was presented to the public on 12 June 2015 at the conference organised as

¹ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52014DC0477&from=EN>

part of Europa Nostra's European Heritage Congress held in Oslo (Norway) (Fig. 1). This nearly 300-page report provides compelling evidence of the value of cultural heritage and its positive impact on Europe's economy, culture, society and environment.²



Fig. 1: Group photo of all the participants in the Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe conference holding the Executive Summary of the CHCFE project in front of the Aula of the Domus Media of Oslo University, 12 June 2015. Photo: Felix Quaedvlieg

Let me also draw your special attention to one member of the European Heritage Alliance 3.3.: INTO, the International National Trust Organisation, which has managed to create a large global network of heritage organisations. INTO comes together every two years in September for a large international conference. The next one will take place in Cambridge (UK), to be followed by Indonesia³. Europa Nostra has signed a Memorandum of Understanding with INTO and strongly believes that this existing global network can be a most valuable partner for the building of a true "Global Heritage Alliance".

To be influential and effective, civil society has to be organised, structured and has to be representative. If we claim the right to have a dialogue with UNESCO Institutions, we also have a duty to get well organised. Like we in Europe organised a "European Heritage Alliance 3.3.", in the same way at global level we need to work on forging a proper "Global Civil Society Alliance for Heritage" composed of representative networks and organisations of civil society committed to cultural and natural heritage.

We firmly believe that this structured dialogue has to happen between the meetings of the World Heritage Committee and not only during the session of this Committee! The organisation of an annual "Civil Society Forum for Heritage" would be a useful platform for pooling resources, exchanging best practices, campaigning to save endangered heritage and lobbying. It does not necessarily have to take place before each WHC session; it can also take place mid-term, between the two sessions of the WHC.

We also believe that it is not enough to say that civil society organisations are represented through the two Advisory Bodies, namely IUCN and ICOMOS. We are fully aware that the situation is very different between the field of natural heritage and the field of cultural heritage. While IUCN involves already a large number of NGOs, ICOMOS remains a large international organisation of heritage professionals with international and national committees of its own. ICOMOS plays a crucial role of an expert consultative body to UNESCO, but it is not sufficiently well-equipped to convey the views of civil society to the UNESCO bodies concerned.

As you know, in two days, on the first day of the 39th session of the WHC, UNESCO Director-General

Irina Bokova will launch a "Global Coalition Unite For Heritage" to encourage pooling of resources between various stakeholders in support of the UNESCO campaign #Unite4Heritage. Europa Nostra has been invited to be one of the partners of this campaign. We were particularly pleased that for this latest campaign, we did not have to knock on the doors of UNESCO; instead UNESCO has knocked on our doors and invited us to be among the first organisations to support this campaign! And we gladly did it.

The increased recognition of the importance and value of heritage as a pillar of sustainable development⁴ combined with increased threats to heritage - in times of conflicts but also in times of peace due to unsuitable development guided by the search of short-term gains - mark a new era of partnership: Public authorities are increasingly aware that they have to work with civil society and not against civil society.

This is all about building trust and listening to each other's concerns, learning to talk the language of the other! This is also about imagination; about finding a magical formula which will meet the legitimate needs of various stakeholders. It always takes time, a lot of time. But I am convinced that when we shall be together celebrating the Golden Jubilee of the World Heritage Convention in 2022 (only 7 years from now!), the spokespersons of a future "Global Civil Society Alliance for Heritage" will figure prominently on the podium of speakers, alongside UNESCO Member States and UNESCO Secretariat.

² For the full report see <http://www.encatc.org/culturalheritagecountsforeurope/>

³ for more information visit www.internationaltrusts.org

⁴ cf. Hangzhou Declaration http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/final_hangzhou_declaration_english.pdf

Europa Nostra – Europe’s Civil Society in Action for Heritage

Europa Nostra is the European federation of heritage NGO’s. Covering 40 countries in Europe, we are the Voice of Civil Society committed to safeguarding and promoting Europe’s cultural and natural heritage. Our **pan-European network** comprises 250 heritage NGOs with a combined membership of more than 6 million people; as well as 150 public bodies or private companies and 1000 individual members who directly support our work. Founded in 1963, Europa Nostra is today recognised as the most representative and influential heritage network in Europe. World famous opera singer and conductor Maestro Plácido Domingo is the President of Europa Nostra.

The 3 pillars of Europa Nostra’s action are:

1. celebrating the most outstanding heritage achievements in Europe,
2. helping save Europe’s most endangered monuments and sites, and
3. lobbying for heritage at the European level.

Every year, Europa Nostra and the European Commission recognise the excellence and dedication of professionals and volunteers involved in cultural heritage. Established in 2002, the **European Union Prize for Cultural Heritage / Europa Nostra Awards** is Europe’s highest honour in the field. A total of 415 outstanding heritage accomplishments have been recognised in the past 13 years. Among the numerous award-winning projects integrated in World Heritage Sites are the rehabilitation of the Valletta Waterfront in Malta (2005); the conservation of the Roman Bridge, Calahorra Tower and Surrounding Areas in Cordoba in Spain (2014); the research and digitisation project “Wonders of Venice” in Italy (2015); and the education, training and awareness-raising project “Teaching Manual: the Fortifications of Vauban” in France (2012).



Fig. 2: Venice has been threatened by the impact of very large cruise ships sailing through the lagoon.

Photo: Europa Nostra

Europa Nostra has campaigned alongside its members to preserve numerous threatened heritage sites in Europe, such as Venice and its Lagoon (since the 1960s) (Fig. 2) and Mont Saint Michel in France (in the 2010s). Collaboration between various bodies is vital

to ensure that the treasures of our past are safeguarded for present and future generations. Through **The 7 Most Endangered** programme, set up in 2013 in partnership with the European Investment Bank Institute and with the support of the Council of Europe Development Bank, we mobilise both public and private partners to rescue the most threatened landmarks in Europe (Fig. 4).



Fig. 4: The 7 Most Endangered monuments and heritage sites in Europe 2014.

Photo: Europa Nostra

With our extensive network of heritage stakeholders operating at local, regional, national and European levels, we contribute actively to the establishment of a real European Strategy for Cultural Heritage and to the mainstreaming of cultural heritage in EU policies, actions and funding. In 2014, we received an EU grant from the Creative Europe programme to support our 3-year Network project ‘Mainstreaming Heritage’.

Europa Nostra was the initiator and is the coordinator of the **European Heritage Alliance 3.3.**, launched in Amsterdam in 2011. Today this Alliance brings together 33 heritage networks to lobby for an effective EU strategy related to cultural and natural heritage.

Led by Europa Nostra in partnership with 5 other organisations, the European cooperation project **Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe** (2013-2015) has collected and analysed evidence-based research and case studies on the economic, social, cultural and environmental impacts of cultural heritage in Europe.

We have participated in the **New Narrative for Europe**, an initiative led by the European Commission’s former President José Manuel Barroso, since its launch in 2013, and currently pursued under the leadership of EU Commissioner for Education, Culture and Youth, Tibor Navracsics.

The Protection of the World Heritage is Essential – Including Kurdish Areas

Giyasettin Sayan, Kurdish Society for the United Nations

The Kurdish Society for the United Nations (UNA-Kurd) is a non-partisan and non-denominational NGO that was founded in 2013 in order to establish an exchange between the United Nations and the Kurds, and to participate as far as possible in all opinion-forming and development processes of the UN. The reason behind the formation of this society is the still unresolved issue of international recognition of the Kurdish people and their rights. The Kurds are not represented in international organizations because they have no official state. Therefore UNA-Kurd works towards gaining a voice and access to international institutions and processes for the Kurdish people.

Our members and regional groups inform the Kurdish public about the work of the United Nations and encourage as many Kurds as possible to partake in all the different UN programs, boards, divisions and events. On the one hand, we want to help our people become familiar with the international system and to prepare them for a time when we might be able to participate there as a full member. We want to prove that we are ready and able, like other nations, to play our role in the United Nations system. Our first important goal now is to obtain consultative status with the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) of the United Nations.

Specifically, we will serve the Kurdish citizens by;

1. providing as much information as promptly as possible about the many options of involvement within the United Nations, about their work, appointments, and processes found on our website, and at events and through available publications;
2. trying to acquire knowledge of the ways in which participation with different UN bodies is possible, and to make this knowledge available to the Kurdish people and communities in their languages, so as to allow access to the UN and the rights and participation processes;
3. offering training, knowledge, contacts and techniques as well as opportunities for empowerment and participation;

4. following and debating various activities of the UN through a lively and open culture of discussion;
5. inviting guests from the UN and other actors (from Germany, the EU, and other regions) to discuss particular issues of the Kurdish commitment to peace and human rights, approaches and solutions, and making information about all processes freely accessible in the Kurdish languages;
6. inviting all Kurds, particularly enabling the younger generation living in Germany, to play an active role within the UN through early human rights education and by encouraging their participation.

In the history of mankind, ruling nations and nationalist states have repeatedly oppressed, assimilated, or eliminated the cultures of the people living in their imperial or state borders. Cultural property such as language, music, literature, cultural and historical heritage, monuments, unique regional qualities, and forms of landscape use



Fig. 1: Ishak Pasha Palace overlooking the nearby town of Dogubayazit, Agri Province. The palace combines Seljuk, Armenian, and Ottoman architectural styles. Photo: Jochi / alphacoders

were and are at the mercy of those in power, sometimes destroyed or plundered. So it is today with the Kurdish culture and their settlement areas in Turkey, Iran, and Syria. Therefore, the protection and preservation of our culture is of particular importance and priority to us. Especially considering the difficult political conditions in which we live, civil society has a very special role in this.

Through World Heritage Watch, we hope to gain better access to the information and procedures of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention. UNA-Kurd can show how we can, as a civil society organization, do something for our cultural heritage, even if the official way is blocked for the time being.

Since its establishment, UNA-Kurd has organized several discussions on various topics, including one on cultural heritage in areas inhabited by Kurds. It is our goal to protect the cultural and natural heritage in areas where Kurds live. Although the Kurds cannot be a member of the relevant UNESCO conventions, we are guided by

- and the 2005 UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity, which states that cultural diversity forms a common heritage of mankind and, for the benefit of all, is to be cherished and preserved.

In a very interesting presentation held before UNA-Kurd, Prof. Dr. Volker Martin, professor of urban development and spatial design at the Brandenburg Technical University of Cottbus, explained in a very impressive and forceful way the need for the protection of unique historical cultural sites and landscapes in the Kurdish areas.



Fig. 2: Church of the Holy Cross on the island of Akdamar, Lake Van, Van Province. The church and its monastery have been a cultural center of the Armenians. Photo: www.motaen.com

By means of a presentation, Professor Martin explained which cultural sites in the Kurdish areas, from a scientific perspective, have an outstanding rank and potential as World Heritage Sites. The city walls of Diyarbakir, the castle of Erbil, the ancient sites of Hasankeyf and Lake Van, to name just a few, met these criteria, since they have been maintained over millennia, again and again developed and preserved by various cultures, and therefore have outstanding importance for the entire human race. He recalled that the

these conventions and treat them as the internationally binding legal and technical frame of reference in our work with cultural heritage. These conventions include, in particular;

- the 1972 UNESCO World Heritage Convention whose list includes 1007 cultural and natural monuments worldwide,
- the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage,

Kurdish areas coincide in large part with the cultural region of Mesopotamia, the cradle of humanity and the development of cities. The Kurds are not always the founders of these cultural sites, but would have used, developed and preserved these place and landscapes over millennia. Consequently, it is indispensable to advance the scientific analysis and the formation of a commission that pursues the safeguarding and protection of these important places for humanity.



Fig. 3: The village of Harran with its unique architecture. According to legend, it is the village of Abraham, the first of the three biblical patriarchs and founder of monotheism. Photo: Goats on the Road

In this context, Professor Martin made clear that it made no sense to favor national Kurdish heritage, but to take into account the sites' importance for historical development, their usage as well as sustainable development and protection. This would require from the outset that the UNESCO standards are followed. In the case of Erbil, that is already the case. The possible determination of their importance for humanity by international scientists would be followed by the nomination with UNESCO, which can only be done by the respective national state in charge.



Fig. 4: Göbekli Tepe, in Şanlıurfa Province, is the oldest built religious site in the world, marking the transition from hunter/gatherer to agricultural societies about 12,000 years ago.

Photo: Aetherforce

In Turkey, 10 monuments so far have been recognized as World Heritage Sites, one of which is located in the Kurdish area. In Iran there are eight, three in Iraq, and three in Syria. None of them is a Kurdish monument. Among the many other unique monuments we would like to investigate for their potential to be World Heritage are:

- Ishac Pasha Palace from the 18th century in Doğubayazıt;
- the old city of Şanlıurfa, the ancient Edessa, known as the city of the Prophets Job and Jethro;
- the village and the oasis of Harran with its unique dwellings, the birthplace of Abraham, and the origin of monotheism;
- the citadel of Bitlis;
- the prehistoric site of Göbekli Tepe, which documents the transition from a hunter-gatherer culture to agriculture and from animism to polytheism;

- the old town of Bireçik on the Euphrates, where a small population of Bald ibis lives, a globally threatened species.

The numerous participants of Kurdish organizations welcomed the initiative of UNA-Kurd to start this discussion, and called for the creation of a "Kurdish Cultural Commission".

In the meantime, a first initiative group has met and discussed how to proceed. Initially, with the help of Professor Martin, more scientists should be canvassed in order to catalog cultural sites lying in the Kurdish areas and to work out their meaning for humanity. Simultaneously, we have met with Kurdish local politicians in order to organize a Kurdistan-wide conference

on the subject. We hope that we will be able to bring the cultural heritage in the Kurdish areas to the attention of the international public, and ultimately to persuade the governments of the countries on whose territory they are located to nominate them for inscription on the UNESCO List of World Heritage. We invite all interested colleagues to collaborate with us to achieve this goal.

The German Foundation for Monument Protection

Dr. Holger Rescher, Deutsche Stiftung Denkmalschutz¹

Man-made constructions are testimonies of our history, and they characterize our villages, towns and cultural landscapes. They provide a picture of the great artistic creativity and regional diversity in Germany. Stone, soil and garden monuments are more than just materials: they create identity, coin the perception of values, are lively places of memory, landmarks, monuments or places of refuge, and connect people across borders.

Goals

The preservation of this unique cultural heritage and the promotion of public awareness for monuments in Germany are the key concern of the Deutsche Stiftung Denkmalschutz (German Foundation for Monument Protection). In an unbiased way it fosters rehabilitation of monuments of all kinds nationwide, from entire buildings to ground and garden monuments (Fig. 1). In doing so, the Foundation aims to support civic commitment for monuments and provides balanced support in all regions of Germany.

Public awareness of the value and conservation of historical evidence is strengthened by the Foundation with great commitment through numerous events and projects for the young and old. For the promotion of civic commitment, the German Foundation for Monument Protection initiates and maintains an active exchange of views and experiences as well as the creation of networks for the preservation of historical, artistic, urban and archaeological monuments.

Funding

The German Foundation for Monument Protection is a foundation under private law. It is supported by a large civic engagement, and it finances its work primarily through private donations (as well as endowments and inheritances) which it collects, as well as from lottery proceeds.



Fig. 1: Restoration of a putto.

Photo: JBH Soest / Deutsche Stiftung Denkmalschutz

Project funding

When it comes to projects funded by the German Foundation for Monument Protection, monuments of all categories are taken into account. The Foundation uses its resources where owners are unable to raise their contribution alone for the conservation of a monument. Therefore, it primarily promotes monuments owned by private institutions, associations, churches, individuals or municipalities. The foundation makes a particular effort for monuments acutely threatened by decay and for supporting owners who take permanent care of a monument and its maintenance.

¹ German Foundation for Monument Protection

Each grant is made for specifically planned measures. Care is taken so that the outer shell is first rehabilitated before interiors and inventory are restored. Simultaneously, the Foundation ensures that monuments of various kinds and in various cultural regions are supported, in order to safeguard diverse monument landscapes.

From the time of application until the end of the action, projects are assisted by architects and specialists of the German Foundation for Monument Protection. They check the documents submitted, conclude the funding contracts, and perform on-site quality control of the action.

Public relations

The German Foundation for Monument Protection strives to get as many people as possible interested in the subject of monument protection. Accordingly, we cover a broad range of activities to encourage civil participation and education. We disseminate information at booths at trade fairs and exhibitions, and we have a traveling exhibition that visits many places in Germany. The information we distribute gives an insight into the work of the Foundation.

Through coordinating the “Day of the Open Monument”, the Foundation reaches an audience of millions. Every year, on the second Sunday in September, more than 7,500 monuments open their doors and provide interested visitors a glimpse into buildings which are usually closed.

An intensive insight into the work of the German Foundation for Monument Protection and its funded projects is provided to the participants of our “**Monuments Travel**” program. During study tours over several days through various regions of Germany, tourists experience firsthand what the Foundation accomplishes on site (Fig. 2).



Fig. 2: Explanation of traditional building during a tour organized by “Monuments Travel”.

Photo: Harenberg / Monumente Reisen

Books, calendars, note cards and much more are printed by our “**Monumente**” publishing house. The surplus from the sale supports the works of the Foundation.

A series of charity concerts (“**Keynote D**”) take place at monuments in need of support, and the proceeds are used directly for their restoration. Since these concerts are broadcast on the radio, they are also able to advertise for the preservation of monuments.

Our program “**Active Monument - Heritage Catching On**” brings school children and young people in touch with conservation. With expert support the pupils explore and investigate the cultural heritage of their local environment.



Fig. 3: Promotion of a “Year as a Volunteer” in monument protection for young people on the “Day of the Open Monument” in Bremen 2012.

Photo: Roland Rossner

Our “**Young Masons Guilds**” build on the tradition of this practice from medieval times: in an alternative way of working, young people are familiarized with the care of monuments. Other young people can gain practical experience at various locations throughout Germany by passing a year as a volunteer in monument preservation (Fig. 3).

Specialists and interested amateurs can educate themselves about various topics in our **Monument Academy**. The seminars, in addition to mostly private builders, also target employees of the building authorities, architects and students.

III.

Assessments of World Heritage Sites



Natural Properties

Moderator: Günter Mitlacher
(WWF Germany)

The Tasmanian Wilderness: Civil Society Involvement in Protecting World Heritage

Geoff Law, Wilderness Society Australia

On 14 December 1982, Tasmania's wild Franklin River was listed as World Heritage. It was also the day that large-scale protests against dam construction broke out on the river. This was not a coincidence, but rather Australia's most graphic example of the involvement of civil society in defending World Heritage.

The Franklin River is part of the Tasmanian Wilderness, a large tract of natural country on the island of Tasmania. It is one of only two World Heritage properties on Earth to satisfy seven of UNESCO's ten criteria for outstanding universal value. The natural heritage includes a pristine coast, glacial landscapes, complex karst systems, ancient biota and threatened species such as the Tasmanian devil. Cultural heritage includes the cave deposits, rock art and shell middens of the Tasmanian Aboriginal people.

Civil society in Australia has been intimately involved with every stage of the World Heritage process, including conceptualization, public promotion, boundary delineation, nomination, listing and monitoring. As a result, conservation efforts and the World Heritage status of the Tasmanian Wilderness have become inextricably linked.

1974–1983: The Franklin River and Tasmania's first World Heritage listing

Australia became a signatory to the World Heritage Convention in 1974. That very same year, the Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF) identified Tasmania's wilderness as a potential World Heritage Area (Mosley 2015) and later published a major description of the area's natural and cultural heritage (Gee & Fenton 1978, pp. 249, 257, 271). These ideas were given life and momentum by the Tasmanian Wilderness Society through the media of press coverage, colour booklets and even bumper stickers for cars. This led to the Australian Government's nomination of part of Tasmania's wilderness for World Heritage in 1981 (Tasmanian Government, AHC 1981).

When the Tasmanian nomination was considered by the World Heritage Committee in Paris, conservationists were being arrested next to the Franklin River. Their acts of civil disobedience dram-

atized the conflict between heritage conservation and resource development. Upon approving the listing, the UNESCO said:

The Committee is seriously concerned at the likely effects of dam construction in the area... In particular, it considers that flooding of parts of the river valley would destroy a number of natural and cultural features of great significance... The Committee therefore recommends that the Australian authorities take all possible measures to protect the integrity of the property. The Committee suggests that the Australian authorities should ask the Committee to place the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger until the question of dam construction is resolved. (UNESCO 1982)

Such calls challenged Australia's federal system. The national government was a signatory to the Convention, but it was the provincial Tasmanian Government that was building the dam and hostile to external intervention.



Fig. 1: Election advertisement 'Vote for the Franklin', March 1983, Age and Sydney Morning Herald. Photo: Peter Dombrovskis

The conservation movement helped resolve this impasse at the 1983 national election by supporting political parties prepared to stop the dam. Leaflets were delivered to every household in over 20 marginal electorates across Australia and a dramatic double-page colour advertisement (Fig.1) was placed in major metropolitan newspapers (National South-West Coalition 1983). When

the Labor government of Bob Hawke was elected, it immediately passed the World Heritage Properties Conservation Act 1983, thereby prohibiting work on the Franklin Dam (Coper 1983, p. 1). This may have been the world's first-ever legislation whose explicit intent was the protection of World Heritage. Nevertheless, the law was challenged in the High Court of Australia by the Tasmanian Government. The Wilderness Society attended the court hearings in large numbers and unsuccessfully attempted to inject photographs of the threatened World Heritage sites into the court's deliberations (Law 2008, pp. 247-250).

By a margin of four votes to three, the High Court ruled that the dam could not be built (High Court of Australia 1983). Crucial to the decision were Australia's obligations under the World Heritage Convention (Coper 1983, pp. 2-3). Not only had Tasmania's wild rivers been protected, but now there were laws to protect World Heritage in other parts of Australia as well.

1986–1989: Extension of the Tasmanian Wilderness

Back in Tasmania, a new debate was brewing. The island's 769,355-ha World Heritage property had boundaries that excluded significant forestry resources. Along the property's eastern boundary were forests whose high ecological integrity was being destroyed by clear-cut logging.

When peaceful protests near the World Heritage boundary provoked a violent reaction from loggers (Fig.2), Tasmania's wilderness was once again in the national spotlight (Montgomery 1986). After helicoptering over the contentious forests with conservationists, the Australian Government's most prominent power broker became a 'warrior' for the cause of World Heritage (Richardson 1994, p. 214). Within a year, new legislation protected contentious forests while an inquiry determined whether they should be nominated for World Heritage (*Lemnathyme and Southern Forests (Commission of Inquiry) Act 1987*).

Conservationists played an instrumental role in formulating the case for an extension of the World Heritage property to include the world's tallest hardwood trees (Law 1987). But in a win for the logging industry, the inquiry's majority report found that only 10% of the forests would qualify as World Heritage (Helsham & Wallace 1988). Galvanized by the impending loss of the forests, conservationists took to the streets in their thousands (McCulloch 2001, pp. 241-243). Famous artistic figures spoke out for the forests (Gee 2001, pp. 223, 242). Experts who had testified to the outstanding universal value of the forests repudiated the majority findings and supported the minority report by the inquiry's expert in natural heritage (Hitchcock 1988).

A divided Australian Government wrestled with the issue for weeks before agreeing to a fractured World Heritage nomination (Hawke 1988) that excluded large tracts of the relevant forests. IUCN iden-

tified this defect in its evaluation (IUCN 1989, p. 15). Even as it did, the winds of change were blowing in Tasmania. In 1989, the conservative pro-logging regime was replaced by a minority Labor government supported by five Independents linked in the common cause of protecting Tasmania's wilderness. Their negotiations added significant tracts of rainforest, wild rivers, moorlands and mountains to the nomination (Brown et al. 1989).



Fig. 2: Green MP and World Heritage advocate, Bob Brown, attacked by loggers in forest protest, March 1986. Photo: Fred Kohl

The World Heritage Committee approved the extension, increasing the area of the property by 78 % (UNESCO 1989). Conservationists celebrated the achievement. However, most of the tall-eucalypt forests whose World Heritage qualities had been confirmed remained outside the property and threatened by logging. This paved the way for two more decades of confrontation (Law 1994).

1990–2014: An old growth problem

With each year, logging operations pushed deeper into the forested valleys of western Tasmania. Conservation campaigns enjoyed some localized successes but the logging industry tightened its institutional grip on government policy (Tasmanian Government & Australian Government 1997).

The mid-2000s ushered in a trying period for the relationship between NGOs, the Committee, the advisory bodies and the Australian Government in grappling with the Tasmanian Wilderness. In 2007, the Wilderness Society expressed its fears for the integrity of the World Heritage property persuasively enough for a reactive mission to be instigated (UNESCO 2007). Conservationists, excited that the voracious logging industry would be scrutinized by international heritage experts, prepared a multitude of briefings.

The three-man mission was helicoptered over ancient forests and gaping clearcuts on a fine day in March 2008. Hopes were high that the mission would recommend an extension to the Tasmanian Wilderness that would include the threatened forests.

In May 2008, those hopes were dashed. The mission did not recommend protection of the threatened forests (Rao, Lopoukhine & Jones 2008). Despite this blow, the IUCN stood by its earlier resolutions that the Tasmanian Wilderness should be extended to include



Fig. 3: Forest photo used for campaign posters advocating World Heritage.

the Committee, collaborating with the Australian Government. A Committee decision to approve the minor modification ensued (UNESCO 2013a).

Even then, the forests were not safe. Another change of government brought with it a proposal to rescind 74,039 ha of the Tasmanian Wilderness to allow logging (Australian Government 2014, pp. 8-9) (Fig. 4). This move whipped up a storm of outrage amongst indigenous groups, ENGOs, the Law Society and the Australian Senate (Senate Environment and Communications References Committee 2014). Advisory bodies rejected the proposal (ICOMOS 2014; IUCN 2014; UNESCO 2014b). In Doha, the Committee took less than 10 minutes to dismiss the proposed excision (UNESCO 2014a). The Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area had been successfully defended yet again.

Conclusions

Passionate campaigns by civil society for the Tasmanian Wilderness have combined evocative photography (Fig.3) with people power to build a sense of ownership of Tasmania's World Heritage Area. Significant numbers of Australians

regard themselves as guardians of the Tasmanian Wilderness. This has been an essential part of safeguarding this heritage.

adjacent tall-eucalypt forests (IUCN 1990, 1994). A three-member team from the Wilderness Society attended the Quebec meeting of the Committee (Bayley 2008), which requested the Australian Government to 'consider, at its own discretion, extension of the property to include appropriate areas of tall eucalyptus forest' (UNESCO 2008). Hope was revived.

Again, the winds of change blew through Tasmania's institutions. By 2010, the corporation driving the logging, Gunns Ltd, had lost public credibility, share-price value and markets (Beresford 2015). Its collapse stimulated 'peace talks' between conservationists and industry representatives. Simultaneously, the Greens won the balance of power in elections at both state and federal levels in 2010. World Heritage was back on the political agenda.

Community organizations are a powerful driving force in identifying and protecting World Heritage because of their conviction and long-term dedication. World Heritage authorities should not regard engagement with NGOs as just a box-ticking exercise. Such organisations are often the most reliable repositories of knowledge and corporate memory.

Green senators proposed an extension to the Tasmanian Wilderness (Brown 2011). A government-appointed panel of experts verified the World Heritage values of the forests (Hitchcock 2012). In November 2012, a historic agreement between the logging industry and conservation groups was signed (Bayley et al. 2012). It called for a minor modification to the boundaries of the World Heritage Area to include the contested forests. This quickly followed (Department of the Environment 2013). IUCN supported it (IUCN 2013) but ICOMOS required further work to identify cultural heritage (ICOMOS 2013). The draft decision referred the proposal back to the Australian Government (UNESCO 2013b). But after 30 years of toil, conservationists were not prepared to suffer an 11th-hour defeat. They attended the Phnom Penh meeting of

regard themselves as guardians of the Tasmanian Wilderness. This has been an essential part of safeguarding this heritage.

Engagement by civil society in the processes of the World Heritage Convention has been necessary but not sufficient. Long-term protection of Tasmania's heritage has also required persistent and intelligent local action. The success of this advocacy has depended on arguments whose substance has outlived policies, governments and corporations.

The large-scale natural qualities of the Tasmanian Wilderness depend on the wilderness quality of this landscape. Formal recognition of the importance of wilderness in the Convention's instruments would enhance the ability of civil society to inscribe and defend large natural landscapes.

Finally, as far as the Tasmanian Wilderness is concerned, the World Heritage Convention has fulfilled its role beyond the wildest expectations of 40 years ago. It has provided protection whose power and endurance have transcended the vicissitudes of local and national politics.

Photo: Geoff Law




Fig. 4: The Tasmanian Wilderness WHS showing in beige hatching the areas whose removal was sought by the Australian government but rejected by the WH Committee.

Map: Australian Government

References

- Australian Government 2014, *Proposal for a Minor Modification to the Boundary of the Tasmanian Wilderness World heritage Area (Australia)*, Canberra, <<http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/places/world/tasmanian-wilderness/more-information>>.
- Bayley, V 2008, Media Release: *World Heritage Committee Calls for Increased Protection of Tasmania's World-Class Forests*, The Wilderness Society, Hobart, <<https://wilderness.org.au/world-heritage-committee-calls-increased-protection-tasmanias-world-class-forests>>.
- Bayley, V, Edwards, T, Henry, D, O'Connor, M, Padgett, K, Pollard, D, Pullinger, P, Ralph, F & Schneiders, L 2012, *Tasmanian Forest Agreement 2012*, Australian Conservation Foundation; Australian Forest Contractors Association; Australian Forest Products Association; Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union; Environment Tasmania; Forest Industries Association of Tasmania; Tasmanian Forest Contractors Association; Timber Communities Australia; Tasmanian Sawmillers Association; The Wilderness Society Inc; The Wilderness Society (Tasmania) Inc, Hobart.
- Beresford, Q 2015, *The Rise and Fall of Gunns*, New South, Australia.
- Brown, B 2011, *Letter to Environment Minister Tony Burke proposing a minor modification to the Tasmanian Wilderness*.
- Brown, B, Field, M, Armstrong, L, Bates, G, Hollister, D & Milne, C 1989, *The Green/ALP Accord*, Bob Brown, Hobart.
- Coper, M 1983, *The Franklin Dam Case*, Butterworths, Australia.
- Department of the Environment 2013, *Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (Australia), Property ID 181bis, Proposal for a minor boundary modification for submission to the World Heritage Committee*, Australian Government, Australia.
- Gee, H 2001, *For the Forests*, The Wilderness Society, Hobart.
- Gee, H & Fenton, J (eds) 1978, *The South West Book - A Tasmanian Wilderness*, Australian Conservation Foundation.
- Hawke, RJ 1988, *Prime Minister*, Australian Government, Canberra.
- Helsham, M & Wallace, R 1988, *Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Lemonthyme and Southern Forests*, Canberra.
- High Court of Australia 1983, *Commonwealth v Tasmania*, <<http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/cases/cth/HCA/1983/21.html>>.
- Hitchcock, P 1988, 'Minority Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Lemonthyme and Southern Forests'.
- 2012, *IVG Forest Conservation Report 5A: Verification of the Heritage Value of ENGO-proposed Reserves*, Department of the Environment,, Australian Government, Australia, <<http://www.environment.gov.au/system/files/resources/efde0e6-0f83-486d-b0c3-8b1d25abc497/files/ivgconservation5aheritage.pdf>>.
- ICOMOS 2013, *Addendum, Evaluations of Nominations of Cultural and Mixed Properties to the World Heritage List, ICOMOS Report for the World Heritage Committee, 37th ordinary session, Phnom Penh, June 2013. WHC 13/37.COM/INF.8B1.Add*, ICOMOS, Paris, <<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2013/whc13-37com-8B1infAdd-en.pdf>>.
- 2014, *Addendum, Evaluations of Nominations of Cultural and Mixed Properties to the World Heritage List ICOMOS Report for the World Heritage Committee, 38th ordinary session, Doha, June 2014. WHC-14/38.COM/INF.8B1.Add* <<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2014/whc14-38com-inf8B1-Add-en.pdf>>.
- IUCN 1989, *World Heritage Nomination - IUCN Summary, 507: Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)*, <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/181.pdf>.
- 1990, '18.70 Wilderness and Forest Conservation in Tasmania, Australia', in *General Assembly of IUCN*, Perth, Australia.
- 1994, 'Resolution 19.89 Forest Conservation in Tasmania, Australia', in *General Assembly of IUCN*.
- 2013, *Addendum. IUCN Evaluations of Natural and Mixed Properties to the World Heritage List. WHC-13/37.COM/INF.8B2.Add*, <<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2013/whc13-37com-8B2inf-Add-en.pdf>>.
- 2014, *ADDENDUM, WHC-14/38.COM/INF.8B2.ADD, IUCN Evaluations of Nominations of Natural and Mixed Properties to the World Heritage List* <<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2014/whc14-38com-inf8B2-Add-en.pdf>>.
- Law, G 1987, 'If a Forest Could Speak', *Habitat*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 3-6.
- 1994, 'Chipping Away at Tasmania', *Wild*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 67-72.
- 2008, *The River Runs Free*, Penguin, Australia.
- Lemonthyme and Southern Forests (Commission of Inquiry) Act*, 1987, Australia.
- McCulloch, J 2001, 'Harnessing the collective energy', in H Gee (ed.), *For the Forests: A history of the Tasmanian forest campaigns*, The Wilderness Society, Hobart.
- Montgomery, B 1986, 'The Battle of Farmhouse Creek', *The Australian*.
- Mosley, G 2015, *Representation by Geoff Mosley to the draft management plan for the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area*.
- National South-West Coalition 1983, 'Vote for the Franklin', *The Age*.
- Rao, K, Lopoukhine, N & Jones, K 2008, *Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia), Report of the Reactive Monitoring Mission, 15 to 20 March 2008*, UNESCO, IUCN, ICOMOS.
- Richardson, G 1994, *Whatever it Takes*, Bantam, Australia and New Zealand.
- Senate Environment and Communications References Committee 2014, 'Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, May 2014'.
- 1997, *Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement*, by Tasmanian Government & Australian Government.
- Tasmanian Government, AHC 1981, *Nomination of Western Tasmania Wilderness National Parks by the Commonwealth of Australia for inclusion in the World Heritage List*.
- UNESCO 1982, *06COM VIII.20 Western Tasmania Wilderness National Parks*, World Heritage Committee, <<http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/5276>>.
- 1989, *Committee Decisions CONF 004 XV.A: Extension and Change of Name (Tasmanian Wilderness)*, <<http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/3633>>.
- 2007, *31 COM 7B.43 Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)*, <<http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/1424>>.
- 2008, 'Decision 32COM 7B.41', in *Thirty-second General Assembly of the World Heritage Committee*, Quebec, Canada.
- 2013a, 'Decision 37 COM 8B.44 Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)', in *Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the World Heritage Committee, Phnom Penh, Cambodia*.
- 2013b, 'WHC-13/37.COM8B/Add'.
- 2014a, 'Decision 38 COM 8B.47', in *Thirty-eighth General Assembly of the World Heritage Committee*, Doha, Qatar.
- 2014b, *WHC-14/38.COM/8B.Add World Heritage Centre, Paris*, <<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2014/whc14-38com-8B-Add-en.pdf>>.

Water Resource Management of Lake Baikal in the Light of Hydropower Development

Eugene Simonov, Rivers without Boundaries Coalition

Lake Baikal is the oldest freshwater depository on earth, containing 20% of the drinkable water of the planet. It is also a most unique depository of freshwater biodiversity. The lake contains 2,500 species of organisms known to date, with more endemic creatures discovered annually, a diversity unknown even in most tropical lakes. Lake Baikal was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1996 and protected by a special “Law on Lake Baikal” – a unique case in Russian legislation. This law, of course, has no power over what is happening in more than half of the Lake’s watershed - the Selenge River basin in Mongolia.



Fig. 1: Irkutskaya Hydro alters the level of Lake Baikal in Russia.

Photo: Rwb

Additionally, Lake Baikal is not only a natural lake but also a hydropower reservoir. Irkutsk Hydro Power Plant, on the Angara River, was built in 1960 and has had a most profound negative effect on the Lake. The integrity of the Lake’s ecosystem was severely damaged by the artificial regulation of water levels, which ruin natural cycles. To prevent greater damage in the future, the limitation of allowable water level change was explicitly prescribed by the Government in 2001, but unnatural timing and frequency of fluctuations due to flood or droughts were not addressed.

From 2000–2015 Lake Baikal was influenced by a prolonged drought in Mongolia, and in 2014 the main water source, the Selenge River, brought

only half of the water volume it normally supplies to the lake. In early 2015, Russia’s Minister of Natural Resources officially declared Lake Baikal an emergency zone and authorized a quick drop in its water level below the limits prescribed by the Government. A threat to public water supply along the Angara River was cited as the official reason for this extraordinary measure, but the hydropower company gained the most benefits from this action. By late May, the lake’s water level fell to 14 cm below the designated critical level. An “Inter-agency Group to Study the Baikal Water Regime” was established by the Government, but on its first meeting in May 2015, its members stated that they could not develop a long-term water management plan because of unknown impacts from the hydropower development program in upstream Mongolia. Large hydro-electric dams planned there not only threaten the integrity of aquatic ecosystems, but also prevent Russian agencies from reliable water management planning due to the multiple uncertainties they create for the timing and quantity of inflow into Lake Baikal.

The Lake Baikal World Heritage Site receives half of its waters from the transboundary Selenge River shared by Russia and Mongolia. About 25 dams were potentially planned in Mongolia’s Selenge basin by Soviet engineers in the 1970s, and since 1991, one of them, Egiin Gol Hydro, was further explored with support from the Asian Development Bank (ADB) (Fig. 2). In 2008, Russia and




Fig. 2: Hydropower sites suggested in 1976 and currently pursued projects in Mongolia’s part of the Selenge-Baikal basin.

Map: Rwb

Mongolia signed an agreement that hydrological impacts of the dam should be jointly assessed, using standards of the Espoo Convention, and environmental flow norms for Egiin Gol Hydro should be agreed between both sides to prevent any harm to the Lake Baikal World Heritage site (MNR 2008). They also agreed to develop a Joint Comprehensive Management Plan for the Selenge River Transboundary Basin. However, these agreements have never been implemented.

By 2014, the Egiin Gol Hydro design was enlarged from 220 MW to a 315 MW dam, sharply increasing potential environmental impacts. At the same time, the World Bank “Mining Infrastructure Investment Support Project” (MINIS) started exploring the feasibility of another dam, Shuren Hydro, on the Selenge River main channel (Fig. 3), and another reservoir on its major tributary, the



Fig. 3: The Source of Lake Baikal: the Selenge River at the site of the Shuren Dam.
Photo: Rwb

Orkhon River, with an industrial water transfer to the Gobi Desert. The World Bank is encouraging the Mongolian Government’s plan to develop large-scale hydropower on its water-deficient rivers, while in Mongolia wind and solar energy resources are a thousand times more abundant than hydropower. By now, two to four more hydropower projects are being planned in the Selenge Basin. Massive hydropower development may result in irreversible environmental impacts at Lake Baikal, and significant hardships for local communities, for example:

- Disrupting the river flow, changing seasonal rhythms, reducing flow volumes in dry periods and blocking the flow of sediments that is sustaining riverine and lake habitats;
- Blocking migration paths of commercial and endangered fish species;
- Degrading critical habitats, including floodplains, the Selenge River, the Selenge Delta (a Ramsar Wetland of International Importance) and the Lake Baikal UNESCO World Heritage Site, due to the alteration of the Selenge River ecosystem patterns and processes;
- Disrupting the Selenge River fish population will increase competition for scarce resources for people who depend upon the fish stock for their livelihoods.

Improper handling of these concerns by the Mongolian Government and the World Bank prompted the Rivers without Boundaries

Coalition (RwB) and Greenpeace to assist local citizens of Mongolia and Russia in submitting a complaint to the World Bank Inspection Panel (WBIP) in February 2015.

In 2012, RwB had already raised this issue with the World Heritage Committee (WHC) in a special report. That year the WHC did not hear our voice, but NGOs continued to remind WHC about it. In 2013, WHC for the first time addressed the issue, but only “potential impacts from the planned construction of a dam on the Orkhon river” (WHC 2013).



Fig. 4: The Orkhon River has little water to spare.
Photo: Rwb

In 2014, the WHC noted with concern that the State Party of Mongolia continued to consider building the Selenge and Orkhon dams, and requested that no development happen before their potential impacts, including cumulative impacts, on Lake Baikal’s Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) had been duly assessed. The WHC requested Mongolia to invite an IUCN Reactive Monitoring Mission (WHC 2014).

In early 2015, RwB representatives expressed concern to IUCN staff that the Mongolian dams may be similar to the case of the “Lake Turkana National Parks”. This WH property in Kenya is severely affected by the Gibe III dam in Ethiopia, but WHC efforts to prevent Lake Turkana’s destruction failed due to a lack of response from both State Parties. In early 2015, the Gibe III reservoir started filling, leading to a 2 m drop in the lake level and a decrease in the natural level fluctuation. In response, IUCN noted that in the case of Lake Baikal they became involved earlier than in the Lake Turkana case, and hoped for a better outcome.

The 3-day IUCN Reactive Monitoring Mission took place in mid-April 2015, and its report was not posted online until late June. To be able to look at the IUCN Mission Report, the WB Inspection Panel asked to postpone submission of their complaint evaluation report by 30 days, referring to a need to establish evidence of “non-compliance with international treaty” that may justify an investigation of this case.

The initial 2015 WHC Draft Decision, published in May. It only “invites the Russian Federation and Mongolia to continue their cooperation under the Intergovernmental Agreement and to jointly develop a [Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA)] for any future hydropower and water management projects which

could potentially affect the property, taking into account any existing and planned projects on the territory of both countries". In RwB's opinion, that clause needed specifications i.e. a timeframe and desired safeguards. Besides, both countries have no experience in preparing an SEA, and no mutual agreement to conduct SEAs. Moreover, Mongolia has not yet shown Russia any results of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) on the planned dams.

Since the drafting of the WHC Decision in May predated the conclusions of the IUCN Mission, it explicitly stated that amendments may be made as the Mission report is reviewed. If adopted without modification, such a partial decision could increase the probability of negative developments such as:

- Mongolia's refusal to develop a valid Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA) for dams in the Selenge basin within the MINIS Project;
- A continued denial of public participation in the EIAs to NGOs in Russia and Mongolia, and local population in Russia due to the unwillingness of the Mongolian agencies;
- Further suppression of activists advocating alternative solutions for Mongolian energy supply (in 2014 the author was deported until 2024 from Mongolia for opposing dams);
- A refusal to investigate the MINIS case by the World Bank Inspection Panel, which may take away the pressure to follow rules set for the MINIS Project;
- Investment into Egiin Gol Hydro construction by Mongolian and Chinese governments prior to public consultations on the results of the EIA, CIA and SEA;
- A smooth completion of the dam part of the MINIS Project in 2016, with subsequent funding of the construction of the dam by the Kuwait Arab Development Fund, Chinese banks and other sources;
- Inability of Russia to develop a valid water management plan for Lake Baikal which would not compromise its outstanding universal value, due to uncertainty about the water inflow from Mongolia.

There are clear signs that a lack of decisive action on the side of the WH Committee could likely lead directly to a "Lake Turkana" scenario: after receiving the IUCN mission, Mongolia officially announced to start a 60 million USD concession for the construction of access roads and other associated infrastructure for Egiin Gol Hydro (ЭРЧИМ ХУЧНИЙ 2015).

An Afterword

Upon initiative by RwB and Greenpeace, the World Heritage Watch Conference adopted a special resolution that was used to inform the WHC members at the 39th Session. The Resolution reinforced and supported the recommendations of the IUCN mission report, which became publicly available only on the day of its adoption - June 27, 2015 (for the resolution, see p. 197).

Based on the IUCN findings, a new draft WHC decision on Baikal was submitted on June 30 that included requirements for an

impact assessment of Egiin Gol Hydro and two other dams, as well as a basin-wide SEA of water infrastructure plans. The Committee requested that Mongolia should not approve any of the dam projects until the individual dam EIAs and assessments of cumulative impacts for all 3 dams have been completed and reviewed by the World Heritage Center and IUCN. The WHC also requested that Russia reports on ecological consequences of water management in Baikal Lake in conjunction with the existing hydropower plant in Irkutsk.

In a dramatic discussion, including an intervention by the RwB Coalition, the pointed and comprehensive WH Committee Decision was adopted. NGOs can now urge international finance agencies to abstain from funding the dams until results of the assessments are seen by the WHC to comply. Now after both WBIP and WHC issued explicit requirements binding the Government of Mongolia and the WB Management, civil society has a better chance to influence dam planning efforts and prevent harm coming to the Lake Baikal and Selenge River ecosystems.

In July 2015, the World Bank Board of Directors approved an Evaluation Report by the Inspection Panel that recognized the validity of all claims made by the complainants. Given the importance of the issue, the WBIP recommended to defer the investigation by 12 months and put this issue under tight control.

References

- Can the World Heritage Convention save Lake Baikal from hydropower? <http://www.transrivers.org/2015/1567/>
- Climate change is behind Russia's shrinking Lake Baikal experts say. Accessed May 25, 2015. <https://globalvoicesonline.org/2015/05/04/climate-change-is-behind-russias-shrinking-lake-baikal-experts-say/>
- Decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session (Bonn, 2015) <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2015/whc15-39com-19-en.pdf>
- MNR 2008 Ministry of Natural Resources of Russia. Protocol of the 2nd Meeting of Bilateral Environmental Commission in 2008, accessed May 20, 2015 <http://www.mnr.gov.ru/activities/detail.php?ID=138928>
- Report of the Reactive Monitoring Mission to Mongolia concerning the World Heritage Property of Lake Baikal (Russian Federation), 13-17 April 2015 <http://whc.unesco.org/document/137186>
- Records of 39th Session. by Mongolia http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/39com/records/?day=2015-07-01#trv_TzLFMKFE12876, by RwB https://youtu.be/rv_TzLFMKFE?t=11823
- Shapkhayev 2014. Шапхаев Сергей Герасимович. Эколого-правовые аспекты климатической адаптации плотинных ГЭС. Lambert Academic Publishing: Saarbrücken
- Tulokhonov A.K. (ed.) 1999. Hydroelectric power industry and the condition of Lake Baikal's ecosystem / A. A. Atutov, N. M. Pronin, A. K. Tulokhonov et al. — Novosibirsk: Publishing House of the SB Russian Academy of Science, 1999. — 280 p.
- WHC 2012 Decision 36.COM 7B.Add. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/754/documents/>
- WHC 2013 Decision 37 COM 7B.22. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/754/documents/>
- WHC 2014 Decision 38 COM 7B.76. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/754/documents/>
- World Bank Inspection Panel. Mongolia Mining Infrastructure Investment Support (P118109) and Mining Infrastructure Investment Support - Additional Financing (P145439) <http://ewebapps.worldbank.org/apps/ip/Pages/ViewCase.aspx?CaselId=107>
- ЭРЧИМ ХУЧНИЙ САЛБАРЫН ТОМООХОН АСУУДЛЫГ ШИЙДВЭРЛЭЛЭЭ. 2015-05-26 12 <http://energy.gov.mn/c/456>

Tajik National Park: Conservation Challenges in a Low Income Country

Martin Lenk, CIM Expert in Tajikistan

Natural world heritage sites in low income countries

The preamble of the World Heritage (WH) Convention of 1972 states “that protection of this heritage at the national level often remains incomplete because of the scale of the resources which it requires and of the insufficient economic, scientific, and technological resources of the country where the property to be protected is situated” (Convention..., 1972, p. 1). The initiators of the convention were further inspired by the idea that a joint effort within the international community would warrant efficient protection “by the granting of collective assistance” in response to new threats (ibid.).

Forty-three years since its adoption, 197 natural WH sites are currently listed. Regardless of the convention’s stated aim to support conservation efforts of indigent countries, natural WH sites in these countries seem to be more endangered than those in affluent countries. Using Tajikistan as a reference point for this hypothesis, countries with natural WH sites have been split into two parts: those with a GDP higher and those with a GDP lower than Tajikistan (Fig. 1). Twenty-eight natural WH sites are located in 14 countries ranked less affluent than Tajikistan, out of which almost half (13 sites) are listed as “in danger.” Of those 168 sites in countries richer than Tajikistan, only six are “in danger.”

Not only is there a correlation between the effectiveness of nature conservation and GDP within a country, there is also strong evi-

dence that countries with corruption issues have a higher likelihood of being downgraded on the WH list. Of all natural WH sites that are situated in the top 60% of countries registered under the “Corruption Perceptions Index 2014” (CPI), only four are actually listed as “in danger” (Transparency International 2014). Thirteen sites “in danger” belong to countries in the bottom 40% of the index. Tajikistan is located closer to the bottom end of both rankings.

Main factors affecting conservation of the Tajik National Park (TNP)

a) Boundaries and zones

The boundary of the TNP is more than 1,400 km long, and including the inner boundaries of the “limited economic use zone” and the “traditional use zone”, it totals about 2,000 km. The extension of the TNP from 1.2 to 2.6 million hectares in 2001, and the extension of the core zone which currently covers 77% of the total area since 2012 (related to WH nomination) may sound like a success story for nature conservation, however the achievement may remain purely on paper. If nature conservation measures fail to be properly implemented, and if the local population (and other stakeholders) are unable or unwilling to play by the National Park’s (NP) rules, no substantial success can truly be achieved.

For centuries local people have been making use of the pastures and the hayfields that are partly located in the core zone. There are many examples of questionable decisions regarding the design of




Fig. 1: Correlation of GDP and UNESCO natural WH sites “in danger” as of May 2015.

Sources: World Heritage Centre 2015, International Monetary Fund 2014, own calculations.

the boundaries, which are not justified by conservation criteria, e.g. the TNP’s core zone begins just behind the last houses of Roshorv (the biggest village in the Bartang valley) without any buffer zone. The NP boundary is nothing more than an abstract line on a map that has no visibility in the real world, and remains a topic of discussion among stakeholders (e.g. pastoralists and NP rangers). For the success of the NP project, however, it is vital to

keep the communication about the course of the boundaries simple. One example is to attach the NP boundary wherever possible to existing linear physical structures. These boundaries could be mountain ridges, glaciers, rivers or man-made structures like roads or special demarcations. However, this concept was not adopted

Since the district center Murghab (the settlement with the highest number of inhabitants on the Pamir plateau) has an average annual temperature of -3.9°C , heating is critical for living. After 1990 the Soviet system of external fuel supply collapsed and the communities were largely dependent on plant-based fuel

such as dried manure and *teresken* shrub wood (*Krascheninnikovia ceratoides*). Massive harvesting of *teresken* became a phenomenon at a time when the National Park already existed. There is a need to find sustainable solutions to replace the devastating practice of *teresken* harvesting in Murghab district.

The pastoralist's culture of yak herding in the Pamirs, along with the outstanding nature, is a magnet attracting tourists to the region. The expansions of the park's core zone in 2001 and in 2012 to currently almost 14% of the territory of Tajikistan have vastly reduced (at least formally) the amount of available pasture land. If implemented, this would have a severe impact on the communities. However, since park officials so far have not enforced the grazing ban in the core zone in most places, communities have not experienced this impact. Figure 3 shows that basically all land suitable for grazing in the Karakul sub-district is used, regardless of whether or not it is inside the core zone. "The presence of active herder camps and sightings of livestock grazing in the core area were numerous" (Weaver, 2013, 11).




Fig. 2: Comprehensive map on situation of Tajik National Park in 2015.

Sources: Map based on Google Earth images, UNESCO WH nomination for TNP boundaries and Ranger posts, TAJSTAT (2012) for population data, "Mapfactory" for district boundary, Kraudzun et al. (2014, 57) for wood harvesting, several experts (interviewed 2015) for wood harvesting, fences, poaching, mining and regulation of Yashikul, ACTED (2015) and others for pasture use, own research.

by the planners of the NP in many of its sections. Haslinger and colleagues (2007, p. 160) admitted that hardly any local resource user "is informed about the TNP, the borders and regulations".

b) Conservation of habitats and wildlife

Prior to the foundation of the TNP in 1992, accessible pastoral land was used for grazing. The core zone of the TNP is classified as a wilderness area, where grazing of domestic livestock, harvesting of hay, firewood and the like are not permitted according to acting laws.

Certain plant communities have been significantly degraded even before the independence of Tajikistan. Rickmers, the German head of the German-Soviet Pamir expedition organized in summer 1929, described a place in Tanimas Valley (today TNP core zone) as a "forest camp"; dense woodland, located on a terrace about two meters above the river bed, covered ten hectares (500m x 200m) (Rickmers, 1930, p. 64). Today this woodland is gone.

Flagship species are part of the justification of the existence of the National Park. Two out of four objectives mentioned in the Management Plan relate to wildlife conservation: (1) to preserve the unique and spectacular landscape of the Pamirs with its ecological processes and biological diversity and (2) to protect rare and endangered species of flora and fauna.

Based on interviews, Weaver (2013, 11) concludes that poaching has declined since the end of the civil war, and that wildlife numbers (Marco Polo sheep, Siberian ibex) are recovering. The Snow leopard is at the top of the food chain and therefore benefits from this trend.

The density of these species is highest on the territory of six hunting concessions out of which only one is located inside TNP. Wildlife inside the park in some areas seems to be protected by the gen-

uine inaccessibility of the territory. Most areas of the Pamirs which are comparatively accessible and not actively protected (like few concessions and community-based conservancies established by local hunters) have few or no endangered mammals left. This is a result of poaching, and to some extent competition with livestock, regardless of whether the area is located inside or outside the TNP. Survey data from 2009 suggest that there are more Marco Polo sheep and Siberian ibex outside the TNP than inside.

Concessions and community-based conservancies are performing better than the TNP. Due to benefits from trophy hunting, they have good incentives for wildlife protection. As long as they do have access to the hunting quota, their business model is both promising and beneficial for people and for nature. However, as of now the lucrative Marco Polo sheep trophy hunting is monopolized by a few commercial concessions that use their political power to prevent the issuance of a quota to a community-based conservancy bordering the park.

Furthermore, a community initiative (another conservancy) that established itself inside the park managed by traditional hunters, was blocked until this date due to competitive interests.

There is a serious discrepancy between official statements and actual activities taking place. Officially, no quota is issued to the hunting concession operating inside the park (i.e. running two hunting camps in the core zone), however there are numerous offers for hunts in these camps by various foreign outfitters, and there are pictures of trophies taken there.

Stakeholders of the TNP and projects supporting TNP

Haslinger and colleagues (2007) name some of the core issues of the TNP:

1. The top-down declarations of the protected area (1992 and 2001) without an adequate participatory decision-making process resulted in antagonism between the groups advocating for protection and use of natural resources. Lacking alternatives, local pastoralists are simply forced to ignore the fact that a large share of their pastures and haymaking plots were swallowed by the NP's core zone;




Fig. 3: Pasture lands in the Karakul sub-district (2015). Sources: ACTED project "Promoting local decision making among non-state actors for sustainable decentralized pasture management in Murghab" 2015, own amendments and changes

2. Administrative competences related to the NP territory are fragmented between several governmental entities (districts administrations, ministries, agencies, TNP authority etc.). Their activities are uncoordinated and sometimes contradictory;
3. People perceive the TNP authority (NPA) as a fee collection entity. Other "services" of the TNP authority are not visible. NPA "acts as a rather isolated entity, insufficiently collaborating with other relevant government bodies..." (Haslinger et al., 2007, 160).

Taking into account that the NP territory covers 18% of Tajikistan, NPA was set up as an institution that seems rather weak in addressing all conservation challenges on its own:

- NPA has limited competences on the NP territory (shared with other institutions);
- NPA has neither enough equipment (until recently only one car), nor human resources to control the 1400 km outer border line and 2.6 million hectares;
- Staff is underpaid therefore there is a high turnover of employed rangers.

Haslinger and colleagues (ibid.) also identified a low level of personal interest and commitment by NPA staff, which is not surprising given the overall conditions.

Several interviews conducted in 2015 indicate that the problems listed above remain issues today. Moreover, the planning process for the extension of the core zone in 2012 (as related to the UNESCO nomination) apparently has been following the same non-participatory top-down approach as the original establishment of the park and its extension in 2001. The IUCN missions that recommended to grant the UNESCO WH status must have known about these shortcomings, in particular the facts that (1) the NPA is in no position to manage the park according to IUCN standards and (2) that the current general settings of the park must fail to achieve medium and long-term conservation goals. The nomination is based to a large extent on the unsubstantiated hope that things would improve fundamentally.

Only few donor organizations run projects in the Pamirs. ACTED, a French NGO, which is working in the field of pastoral management in the Murghab district has produced maps (see Figure 2) to improve the management of pastoral resources. The original map did not indicate which pastures are located inside TNP and which outside of it.

A major player in the Pamirs is the Aga Khan Foundation (AKF). Nature conservation is not among the AKF's priorities, but its programs in the region focus on livelihood. Therefore, indirectly AKF is involved in issues related to the park and its resource users. Because of the long-term commitment of the AKF in the Pamir region and its good reputation among local people, the organization could assist in the process of rethinking the current boundaries and zones of the park.

Recommendations

General recommendations for countries with low income and/or weak institutions

1. UNESCO should not include any sites to the WH list that do not have minimal operational management capacity nor should it include any sites with severe conflicts between conservation and resource usage. If a country nominates such a property, UNESCO should guide the applicant to initiate good conservation practices, and include the site after the achievements have been proven to be robust and sustainable.
2. Real "collective assistance" should include long-term commitments to be effective in low income countries. A program for caretakers could be designed as a **World Heritage Stewardship Program**. For example, the "Global Heritage Fund", a US-based non-profit organization, supports conservation of significant and endangered cultural heritage sites in developing countries (Global Heritage Fund 2015). Equivalent funds explicitly dedicated for threatened natural heritage sites have yet to be established.

Recommendations regarding the Tajik National Park

1. Revision of the boundaries and zoning must be considered. However, the revision must be an open multi-stakeholder decision-making process.
2. TNP needs not just mid-term and long-term conservation goals, but also a realistic strategy on how to execute and achieve them. To increase dedication and functional capability of the NPA, it has to be provided with sufficient resources.
3. A formal agreement could define the fields of cooperation between the TNP and the local communities. This would improve of the reputation of the park among local people.
4. The donor community, including UNESCO, should support the development processes that are needed to sustain and improve the conservation of the TNP.
5. Tourism is the only permitted use in the TNP's core zone. Community-based tourism and trophy hunting have to be developed to generate income. The compatibility of the TNP's conservation goals with mining and with the regulation of Yashilkul has to be evaluated.

References

- Acted (Agence d'Aide à la Coopération Technique Et au Développement) 2015, 'Karta pastbishchnykh ugodi dzhamoata Karakul', map, (in Russian).
- Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/convention-en.pdf>. [27 May 2015].
- Global Heritage Fund 2015, Mission. Available from: globalheritagefund.org/about_us/ghf_mission. [10 August 2015].
- Haslinger, A., Breu, T., Hurni, H. & Maselli, D. 2007, 'Opportunities and risks in reconciling conservation and development in a post-Soviet setting: The example of the Tajik National Park', *International Journal of Biodiversity Science & Management*, 3(3): 157-169.
- International Monetary Fund 2014, List of countries by GDP (PPP), Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_GDP_%28PPP%29. [27 May 2015].
- Kraudzun, T., Vanselow, K.A. & Samimi, C. 2014, 'Realities and myths of the Terek Syndrome - An evaluation of the exploitation of dwarf shrub resources in the Eastern Pamirs of Tajikistan', *Journal of Environmental Management*, 132: 49-59.
- Rickmers, W.R. 1930, 'Alai! Alai!', Brockhaus, Leipzig (in German).
- TAJSTAT (Agency on Statistics under the President of the Republic of Tajikistan) 2012, 'Gorodskie poseleniya i selskie naselennye punkty Respubliki Tadjikistan po dannym perepisi naseleniya i zhilishchnogo fonda 2010 goda'. Dushanbe (in Russian).
- Transparency International, 2014, 'Corruption Perceptions Index 2014'. Available from: <https://www.transparency.org/cpi2014/results>. [27 May 2015].
- United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division 2015, 'World Population Prospects: The 2015 Revision, Key Findings and Advance Tables'. Working Paper No. ESA/P/WP.241.
- Weaver, L.C. 2013, 'Feasibility study: The Potential for Sustainable Hunting Management in the Context of the Tajik National Park and the recently established Tajik World Heritage Site', Available from: GLZ Funded Sustainable Use of Natural Resources in Central Asia / Wildlife Management Project.
- Worboys, G.L., Lockwood, M., Kothari, A., Feary, S. & Pulsford, I. (eds.) 2015, 'Protected Area Governance and Management', ANU Press, Canberra.
- World Heritage Centre 2015, World Heritage List. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/?&&&type=natural>. [27 May 2015].

Implementation of UNESCO Decisions and New Threats in the Western Caucasus

Yuliya Naberezhnaya and Dmitriy Shevchenko, *Ekologicheskoy Vakhty po Severnomu Kavkazu*¹

The Lunnaya Polyana Ski Resort

In 1999, a series of protected areas in the Western Caucasus covering 282,500 ha was awarded the supreme conservation accolade of natural World Heritage site status. The nomination included the following areas: Caucasian State Nature Biosphere Reserve and its buffer zone; Bolshoiy Tkhach National Park; the natural monuments of Buinyi Ridge; the headwaters of the River Tsitsa; and the rivers Pshekha and Pshekhaskha. Conservation problems with this World Heritage site started almost immediately. In 2002, construction began of a winter ski resort 'Lunnaya Polyana' ("Moon Glade") in the area of Mount Fisht. In 2005, the Russian Ministry of Natural Resources changed the borders of the protected area, leading to the loss of protected area status for Moon Glade. In 2007 an additional plot of 200 hectares was rented to the oil extraction company Rosneft for a period of 49 years (Fig. 1).

In 2007, the construction of the road from the village of Chernigovskoe in the district of Absheronsky to Moon Glade was begun without any licensing documentation. In total, 15 kilometers of new roads were built within the Western Caucasus area, with about 10 kilometers located on the natural monument "Headwaters of the River Pshekha and Pshekhaskha" and five kilometers on the territory of the Caucasus Nature Reserve. The joint efforts of organizations such as Greenpeace and WWF (and other members of Environmental Watch) in the region as well as a visiting mission of UNESCO experts in June 2008 meant that interventions were made and road construction within the Western Caucasus was completely stopped. However, in 2011 construction

restarted when the road to the 'Biosphere Scientific Center' was rebuilt in the city of Sochi.

In early 2013, by order of the Ministry of Natural Resources, more road construction works began in the Caucasus Nature Reserve, this time under the pretext of creating a route to the meteorological station. The meteorological station to where the road was planned to lead is currently only in the design phase, and there is a danger that the planned weather station will be used as a guise for the building of additional recreational facilities. The 10 kilometers of constructed roads through the Reserve have led to widespread logging in the Valley of Shakhe River of Georgian boxwood trees, a




Fig. 1: Areas threatened in Western Caucasus WH site.

Map: Official re-nomination 2014 of the UNESCO property D900 "Western Caucasus". Academic Department of the Caucasus State Natural Biosphere Reserve

- Boundaries of the nominated property "Western Caucasus"
- Caucasus Nature Reserve
- Nature Park "Bolshoi Tkhach"
- Nature Monument "The upper reaches of Pshekha and Pshekhaskha Rivers"
- Nature Monument "The upper reaches of Tsitsa River"
- Nature Monument "Buinyi Ridge"
- Nature Monument "Buxus Colchica Plantings"
- Sochi State Wildlife Sanctuary
- Nominated part of the Sochi National Park
- Buffer zone of the Caucasus Nature Reserve included in the Object

¹ Environmental Watch on Northern Caucasus

Colchis-Caucasian relic species which is on the list of the Red Data Book of the Russian Federation, with other violations of environmental legislation. At the time of writing, highway construction has reached 'Cordon Babuk-Aul' and the access there is closed to public inspection for "security reasons."

From 2008 - 2014, the World Heritage Committee requested Russia "to do everything possible to prevent the large-scale construction of ski and tourist infrastructure in the Western Caucasus" (Decision 38.COM 7B.77). Despite warnings from UNESCO, large-scale infrastructure development continues in the territory of the Moon Glade near the Fisht-Oshtenskovo massif. During an inspection in November 2014, representatives of Northern Caucasus Environmental Watch saw that construction of ski lifts had begun, containers were being brought to the territory by helicopter as part of the construction process, while slopes were cleared so that the basic infrastructure could be built² (Fig. 2-3). It is very clear that the UNESCO recommendations continue to be ignored by the WHC State Party.

The Lagonaki Resort

In June 2010, plans for a network of ski resorts in North Caucasus named "Peak 5642" were unveiled at the Economic Forum in St. Petersburg. The "Lagonaki" resort is planned to be built on the territory of a biosphere reserve which is part of the World Natural Heritage site "Western Caucasus". Similarly, another resort planned will affect the natural monument of the headwaters of the Tsitse River.



Fig. 2: Construction of the cable cars to the ski resort.

Photo: Yulia Naberezhnaya

As a result of the uncompromising position of the UNESCO World Heritage Center, the Russian Ministry of Natural Resources instructed authorities of Adygea and Krasnodar Region to draft a proposal to increase the boundaries of the "Western Caucasus" site. The draft was prepared with the participation of the environmental organization NABU-Caucasus (the Russian branch of the German organization NABU), the Institute of Applied Ecology of

2 <http://ewnc.org/node/18545>

the Caucasus, and the Natural Heritage Protection Fund. The Directorate of the Caucasus Nature Reserve was the formal recipient of the draft. The new nomination with the changed borders would increase the area of the World Heritage site to 69,828 hectares due to the addition of the protected areas of the Sochi National Park (on the southern slope of the Greater Caucasus Ridge). However it also foresees the exclusion of an area of 6,500 hectares, which, according to the authors, "does not reflect the criteria of integrity and universal values any more."³



Fig. 3: Lynnaya Polyana elite ski resort on the territory of the World Heritage site.

Photo: Yulia Naberezhnaya

According to the presented schemes, the Lagonaki plateau, most of the Fisht-Oshtenskovo mountain range, and the infamous Moon Glade 'do not reflect the criteria of integrity and universal values'. In February 2014, the renomination draft was sent to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre in Paris. Also a statement from researchers of the Caucasus Nature Reserve was sent to UNESCO to oppose the removal of the plateau of Lagonaki from within the designated boundaries of the property.⁴

Despite recommendations by the World Heritage Committee, illegal woodcutting on the "Western Caucasus" World Natural Heritage Site still occurs systematically today. This includes the natural monuments of the headwaters of the River Tsitse and the rivers Pshekha and Pshekhaskha.⁵

New threats to the south of the "Western Caucasus" World Heritage site are very serious. Promises of environmental compensation for the environmental damage caused by the Olympic Games by expanding the territory of the Caucasus Natural Reserve have not been fulfilled.

Development of the Mzymta River

The most critical part is point 4: "Action Plan for the restoration of the Mzymta river, integrated environmental monitoring and preparation of compensatory measures in the framework of environmental support of the Olympic Winter Games of 2014 in Sochi", which was prepared according to the recommendations of UNEP

3 <http://www.nhpfund.ru/news/2014-01-27.html>

4 <http://www.ewnc.org/node/13918>

5 <http://www.ewnc.org/node/17397>

and UNESCO experts. The upper Mzymta valley still has not been added to the Caucasus Nature Reserve. That is directly related to the planned construction of recreational infrastructure in the upper valley of the Mzymta river. The orders of Deputy Prime Minister Dmitriy Kozak, dated 20 January and 9 February 2015, demonstrate these threats. According to one of them (February 9, 2015 – DK-P13-726), Kozak gave instructions to the Ministry of Natural Resources of Russia and the Russian Ministry of Economic Development “to ensure the establishment of easements to land plots that are necessary for the building of ski resort objects until March 15, 2015”.

The “land plots” mentioned in Kozak’s order are located on the territories of the Caucasian Nature Reserve and the Sochi National Park, which is a Protected Area of Category II of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature. These areas fully meet the criteria of natural World Heritage sites and are recommended for inclusion in the World Heritage Site “Western Caucasus”. They form the buffer zone of the Caucasus Nature Reserve. However, there are plans to build recreational facilities on the territory of the Caucasus Nature Reserve, specifically in the Pslukh Cordon on the Grushevy Ridge as well as in the whole valley of the upper reaches of the Mzymta River, including Lake Kardyvach and the surrounding mountains.

Kozak’s order goes beyond simply studying opportunities or discussing the problem, and the decision was made by two business companies – the Roza Khutor Resort and the Krasnaya Polyana Company – that are both controlled by a joint-stock company belonging to oligarch Vladimir Potanin. The opinions of nature conservation specialists and the environmental community were not taken into account.

The owners of the Roza Khutor Resort plan to expand the territory of the resort by 580 hectares. To make this possible, they are planning changes of the zoning districts of Sochi National Park which will include the construction of additional chair lifts and summer recreation facilities, turning the specially protected zone into a recreational one. Sochi National Park is a specially protected territory, belonging to the ‘National Park’ category.

The ‘Action Plan for Restoration of the Mzymta River Ecosystem’ includes complex environmental monitoring and compensatory measures for the XXII Olympic Games and XI Paralympic Winter Games in Sochi. This was adopted by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of the Russian Federation, hence in theory the whole territory of the Sochi National Park on the Mzymta River should be added to the Caucasus Reserve. Additionally, in 2013 the UNESCO World Heritage Committee asked Russia to “stop all construction work and/or the expansion of buildings and facilities in the upper parts of the Mzymta River and to raise the legal status of the territory to ‘protected’”.

This action plan orders the joining of the entire area of the Sochi National Park located in the upper areas of the Mzymta River

to the Caucasus Reserve, and also advises that Russia fulfill its international obligations and protect the area. However, these actions have not been carried out. Moreover, in May 2015, the Roza Khutor Company began construction of a roadway into the Sochi National Park without holding public hearings or obtaining a state environmental review. The Krasnaya Polyana Company plans to construct new cable cars there as well, on the southern slopes of the Aibga mountain ridge, and it also asserts rights over parts of the Caucasus Reserve and the upper valleys of the Mzymta River.⁶



Fig. 4: A panorama of the stunning mountains of the Western Caucasus.

Photo: Mikhail Plotnikov

On 6 June 2015, the Russian Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment held a meeting in Sochi on the development of skiing facilities in specially protected areas of the Krasnodar Region. At this meeting, Gazprom’s future plans for building skiing facilities in the Psekhako Mountains were also presented. Gazprom would essentially be expanding its skiing resort to these areas, which also form part of the Caucasian State Nature Biosphere Reserve and the “Western Caucasus” World Heritage Site.⁷

The systematic failure to carry out the recommendations of UNESCO with regards to stopping the construction, both underway and planned, on the territory of the “Western Caucasus” World Heritage site and the nearby territories of Sochi National Park are the basis for a request to include the “Western Caucasus” in the list of World Heritage sites in danger. We ask to include information about these circumstances in the Resolution of the World Heritage Watch Conference and to recommend the UNESCO World Heritage Committee to send an appeal to the Russian Federation about the need to immediately add the upper parts of the Mzymta River to the Caucasus Reserve. This is a real chance to prevent new threats to the “Western Caucasus”.

⁶ <http://ewnc.org/node/17442>, <http://www.ewnc.org/node/18613>

⁷ <http://www.ewnc.org/node/18592>

Pirin National Park in Bulgaria affected by Ski Development

Petko Tzvetkov, Toma Belev, Katerina Rakovska and Alexander Dountchev, For The Nature Coalition

Pirin National Park has been a designated World Heritage Site (WHS) since 1982 (criterion vii, viii and ix) as well as an IUCN Category II and a Natura 2000 site according to the EU Birds and

and ski runs¹. The two zones were determined as “buffer zones” of the Property. According IUCN’s World Heritage Outlook, however, “the buffer zone...does not surround the property, but rather makes intrusions into the site”² and it is clear that in fact it fragments the core area of the Property.




Fig. 1: Pirin National Park’s zoning as re-nominated for World Heritage in 2009.
Map: <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/225bis.pdf>, p. 15

the Habitats Directives. The park is very well protected on paper, however, there are serious concerns about the park management due to the construction of the Bansko Ski Zone. In 2010 the WHS was extended and now covers an area of 3,927,772 ha in the Pirin Mountains, and overlaps with the Pirin National Park, as well as with the two ski zones of Bansko and Dobrinishte (1078,23 ha) (Fig. 1). They were excluded from the property in 2010 because “the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has been repeatedly and significantly impacted by the development of ski facilities

It is important to note that the WHC was notified of the Bansko Ski Zone construction before it began. We consider the two buffer zones a compromise, and an sign of the inactivity and weakness of the Bulgarian national institutions and the World Heritage Convention to implement its goal and objectives over the last 15 years.

The Bulgarian nature conservation NGOs are united in the For Nature Coalition of more than 30 NGOs and citizen groups. They have been in contact with the WHC since 2000 at the start of the project, with the request to include Pirin on the List of Sites in Danger. The request is still valid in light of two threats:

1. The draft update of the Pirin NP Management Plan includes a significant downgrading of management regimes.

The 2015 draft of the Pirin NP Management Plan, to be approved in 2015, fully neglects recommendations by the WHC, especially its requests “to prepare detailed *Tourism Implementation Plans*’ for the Bansko and Dobrinishte buffer zones, consolidating existing, approved and envisaged plans in a transparent manner, and ensure that these buffer zone areas are explicit parts of the new Management Plan”... (2012); “to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the development of the buffer zone, including consultations with stakeholders, ... ” (2013); and “... to ensure that the new management plan is subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) prior to being adopted...” (2014).

Initially comprising only 0.54% of the Pirin NP WH Property, at the moment of writing the new management plan envisages an extension of the buffer zones to nearly 65% of the Property (Fig. 2-4). So far, the Ministry of the Environment and Water (MoEW) has

1 <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2010/whc10-34com-8Be.pdf>

2 <http://www.worldheritageoutlook.iucn.org/search/sites/-/wdpaid/en/9613>





Fig. 2: Proposed new zoning of Pirin NP according to the draft new Management Plan 2015. Map: Ministry for Environment and Water of Bulgaria

2. The revision of the Ski Zone Concession Contract draft³ granting 1069.58 ha instead of the existing 99.55 ha.

The Bansko Ski Zone concession contract signed in 2001 grants the concessionaire an area of 99.55 ha to manage the existing and to construct new ski facilities. After pressure by NGOs, the MoEW commissioned a GIS survey and in 2011 presented the results which showed that the concessioner has used 65% more of the area (Fig. 5). Instead of sanctions, what followed were draft interdepartmental reports which favoured private interests, the concessionaire, to be granted 1069.58 ha instead of the current 99.55 ha.

Fig. 4 Chart: Petko Tzvetkov



accepted this concept and has refused to develop and implement a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

These actions do not comply with WHC decisions, in particular with decisions regarding legislation in the buffer zones. In addition, the management of the rest of the park territory is not strong enough, as there is timber exploitation, poaching and overgrazing.

In addition, the government refuses to issue acts for state ownership of lifts and ski runs and restaurants of the territory. The concessionaire Ulen SH sold the ownership to an offshore company - in violation of the Act on Concessions and the State Property Act.

³ http://forthenature.org/upload/documents/2015/03/proekto-reshenie%20MS_KD%20Bansko_23.02.15.pdf

Pirin NP management plans	Territories with existing constructions/infrastructure or without prohibition of construction (in ha)	% from the total Park area	% from the WH Property
Park Spatial Plan, 1993	146,50	0,36	0,54
Management plan, 2004	218,80	0,54	0,80
Proposal of Bansko municipality for amendment of MP 2004, approved by the High Expert Ecological Council of MoEW in 2013, but not approved by the Bulgarian Government	7 920,70	19,63	17,42
Draft Management plan from 25.02.2015	26 558,30	65,81	64,87
Pirin NP total area MP 2004	40 356,00	100,00	
Pirin NP WH Property 1983	27 400,00		100,00
Pirin NP WH Property 2010	39 277,72		100,00
Pirin WH Property Buffer Zone 2010	1078,28	2,67	

Fig. 3 and 4: Increase of the territories with existing constructions/infrastructure or without prohibition of construction within Pirin NP and WHS.

Chart: Petko Tzvetkov

In the period 2001-2013, Bulgarian court decisions failed to secure compliance of actions in the Bansko Ski Zone with the Convention and national legislation. In the last two years, court decisions secured protection of the public interest and the park, while highlighting the inadequacy of previous juridical decisions. Despite this reversal in the juridical practice there have been no adequate responses from the government. Unfortunately the Bulgarian juridical system does not have sufficient credibility, both by the Bulgarian public and the European Commission (i.e. Bulgaria is subject to the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism by the Commission).⁴

Recently, when important decisions affecting Pirin NP are planned, PR campaigns against environmental NGOs are launched by ski development companies.

In view of the number of violations and lack of consequences from institutions, it can be argued that the 'Pirin case' has gone far beyond environmental problems and into the realm of law and order issues. For this reason, intervention by an international institution is still very important.

History of communication and experience with the World Heritage Convention

We frequently identify issues and threats to the Pirin NP WHS and propose solutions to the WHC and IUCN. However one major issue we have identified is the lack of transparency in the correspondence between the state party and the WHC. This further delays the exchange of information and the adoption of effective solutions that meet Convention requirements.

Overall effective action taken by the Committee and the Convention is slow, and from 2000 until today there is no visible result. Also actions are taken reactively rather than proactively. Constructive action on one point was followed by negative ones in other areas, including retreat and exclusion of zones. The continued refusal to include the park in the list of World Heritage Sites in Danger is giving mixed signals to the public and institutions in Bulgaria. These inefficiencies and delays of the Convention are discouraging NGOs and lead to the direct destruction of the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

Another concern is the lack of standardized procedures for the direct involvement and participation of NGOs working at WH sites at the World Heritage Committee meetings – except through advisory bodies like IUCN. As an international organization, IUCN works with a mix of both NGOs and government institutions and often balances these interests. Its recent publication, the World Heritage Outlook report, is an effective tool to raise awareness in the international community. The Pirin WHS was assessed as being of "Significant Concern," sending a message which puts pressure on the Bulgarian Government but does not have the full weight




Fig. 5: Violations of the ski concessions in the Bansko Ski Area.

Map: For the Nature Coalition Bulgaria

of the WH Convention behind it. Based on the current situation reported from Pirin NP and the clear engagement of NGOs not only in the legal protection and monitoring of the Pirin WHS but also with their ability to inform the WHC of changes, they must be involved more effectively in all procedures, processes and structures of the WH Convention.

The pressure for further development inside the WHS is very high, but it is not driven by the local people. An opinion poll commissioned as part of the updated park management plan⁵ asked local people "Do you support nature conservation actions, if at first they have unfavourable social and economic consequences for the area of the settlement" which resulted in a 71% yes vote⁶.

In order to secure the preservation of Pirin, the WH Committee needs to send a much stronger message and include the property of Pirin NP on the List of WHS in Danger. The UNESCO and World Heritage high officials should also appeal for the strict implementation of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee by Bulgarian institutions and the state party.

5 <http://prozrachniplanini.org/f/0/prezentacij-sociologichesko-prouchvane-pu-pirin-20141128.pdf>

6 <http://prozrachniplanini.org/f/0/prezentacij-sociologichesko-prouchvane-pu-pirin-20141128.pdf>

4 http://ec.europa.eu/cvm/progress_reports_en.htm



Historic Cities

Prof. Francesco Bandarin
(Associazione Nazionale Centri Storico-Artistici)

Conservation of the Saint Petersburg World Heritage City: Major Concerns

Elena Minchenok, Vserossiyskoye Obshestvo Okhrany Pamyatnikov Istorii i Kultury (VOOPIK)¹



Fig. 1: A bird's eye view of the historic center of Saint Petersburg, with the Hermitage and the Palace Square.

Photo: Dmitry Moiseenko / AirPano

The UNESCO World Heritage site of Saint Petersburg has existed since 1990 when, by decision of the Committee on its 14th Session, it was listed as “The Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments” (criteria i, ii, iv, vi). Its basic value was the integrity and authenticity of a vast cultural and natural landscape, which at that moment became one of the world's largest WHS. (Fig. 1) However, not only did the chosen components arrive on the list in various technical conditions, but later on, after the fall of the Soviet Union, they happened to be situated on the territories of different sub-federal entities, each having its own domestic legislation and different socio-economic conditions (Fig. 2).

An acute threat to the property emerged in the mid-2000's, when a blast of the country's economic growth became an impulse for a building expansion in St. Petersburg and its suburbs, compromising the integrity of the urban fabric and




Fig. 2: The St. Petersburg World Heritage property. All characters marked in color are elements of the Property. Map: UNESCO

¹ All-Russian Society for the Preservation of Historical and Cultural Monuments



Fig. 3: A computer calculation and modelling of the Okhta Center (Gazprom City) tower in the historic city panorama.
Photo: Pavel Nikonov

the authenticity of the urban panorama. In several years, a vast number of modern development projects emerged that brought on massive demolitions and intrusions into the historic urban fabric. It was then that the project of a 400-meter Gazprom-city/Okhta-center tower was announced which almost put the Property, particularly characterized by its protected, well-balanced, low cityscape, on the list of endangered sites (Fig. 3).

The positive outcome of this situation, however, was a burst of NGOs, pressure groups and civil actors' activity which greatly affected the general level of the historic monuments' protection. Continuous activity of the NGO "The Living City" (founded in 2006), the St. Petersburg office of the Russian National Heritage Preservation Society (VOOPIK, reorganized in 2007) and a large number of various grassroots organizations and experts in the field not only managed to stop the devastating Gazprom tower project but also, through various forms of campaigning, legislative pro-



Fig. 4: Campaigners protesting at a rally (text on the Soviet style poster: "Save our national heritage, the monuments of architecture").
Photo: Elena Minchenok

posals and expert accessions, managed to strongly influence the process, to immensely raise public awareness of heritage protection issues, and to change the balance of powers in the city which greatly reduced law violations and precarious projects (Fig. 4).

The NGO activities were only officially recognized by the city administration in 2008-2009, and the relationships between the governmental bodies and the campaigners are still far from being called an ideal collaboration, but a certain type of partnership has developed in recent years. In particular, it was the non-governmental expert community that contributed largely to the modification of boundaries, components and elements of the property in 2013-2014. A peculiarity of the St. Petersburg case is that a broader scope of civil activity arose from a heritage preservation movement: The same happened in 1986-1987 when the respective campaigns triggered the perestroika events in the city.

By 2015, the general mechanisms of architectural heritage protection in St. Petersburg, compared to the disbalance of the acting forces and the legal vacuum of the mid-2000's, have developed into a reasonable equilibrium, and that is largely thanks to NGO efforts. This, however, happens only within the framework of the federal and local heritage protection legislation, which can be seen as more or less adequate and effective, although it basically has no relation to international regulatory acts such as the 1972 World Heritage Convention.

The Russian legislation for the protection of cultural and architectural heritage lacks almost entirely the core definitions and terms of the Convention, nor is there a concept of WHS management. The Russian heritage preservation system acknowledges various gradations of listed monuments (monuments of federal level, regional level, newly identified monuments, etc.), and a large number of the Property elements have a relevant status – but the territory of the Property as a whole is not stated in any way in federal or local legislation. The situation is worsened by the above-mentioned division of the Property between two sub-federal entities, namely the federal city of Saint Petersburg and the Leningrad Region, each of them having their own local legislation and respective administrative bodies.

In the absence of a common conceptual framework stipulated by federal laws, there is no chance for construction of a coherent model of the property management (and this situation is valid not only for the WHS of Saint Petersburg, but for all the Russian WHSs). The presence of WHSs on the territory of Russia has no official reflection either in the country's legislative system or in governmental policies, the formation of urban development plans or the evaluation of construction projects. There is very little perception of the city and its suburbs as a WHS at all levels, from the city administration and the relevant governmental bodies to the city community.

In early 2015, a Coordination council on preservation, management and promotion of the WHS of Saint Petersburg was formed

on the basis of a trilateral agreement between the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation, and the governments of Saint Petersburg and the Leningrad Region. Members of NGOs or non-governmental experts and activists were not invited to become members of the newly-founded body. As of now, the activities of the Council are limited to popularization and publicity of the 25th anniversary of the first UNESCO site in Russia to be nominated to the list. According to the representatives of the Council, however, the major task of the body thus far is to improve federal legislation by bringing relevance of the Convention into the existing language and to make the formation of the WHS management system possible.

Seeing that as a primary task, there is still the crucial necessity, which has long been emphasized by the NGOs, to make sure that campaigners at all levels do not remain defiantly offended by not having been welcomed to the Council. It is highly desirable that they form a respective non-governmental body that shall concentrate on property management strategies, generate draft amendments to the relevant legislative acts, and the promotion of the very concept of the property as a UNESCO site at all levels. It is most needed as well that such a body receives recognition and direct contact with the WHC in order to coordinate the activities and give more value to the expert proposals and evaluations, as well as to objectively monitor the dangers to the property and to implement countermeasures within the dialogue of the relevant local official bodies. In this case, reciprocally supporting activities of the two bodies, governmental and non-governmental, can sufficiently quicken the process of bringing the Russian legal norms in line with the Convention and formulating property management policies.

This partnership could become a basis for a separate institute that the Russian Federation should absolutely establish to manage the property. It is crucial that this body is at a federal level so that it can address the issue of a site territorially located within two different sub-federal entities.

Another large problem is the physical condition of the property. In the past decades, the state accumulated an enormous infrastructural debt: a large part of the property is in an advanced state of decay, in neglect, or in need of urgent revitalization and repair. Currently the state – i.e., the budgets of the St. Petersburg and Leningrad Regions – are not and will not be able to conduct all needed works within the required scope. Private investors, physical or legal bodies, that absolutely have to be involved in the process, are not motivated enough to start investing into heritage. On the one hand, this is directly connected to the technical burdens brought out by the absence of a property management strategy, and on the other hand, there is a severe lack of financial mechanisms needed to stimulate such private participation in heritage management. (Fig. 5, 6)

In other sub-federal entities, there are examples of relevant mechanisms, which, however, face certain obstacles and difficulties of



Fig. 5, Fig. 6: Ever more old houses are demolished and replaced by modern high-rise buildings which impair the authenticity and integrity of the protected historic urban landscape.

Photos: 5 Alexander Petrosian, 6 Elena Minchenok



implementation. In Moscow, for example, a program for the restoration of historically valuable properties called “A ruble for a meter” was announced in 2012, which offers long-term rent of a historic site at the rate of 1 Russian ruble (approx. 0.016 Euro) per m.sq. after the full cycle of repair and restoration works on the property is executed within 5 years of signing of the contract.

Studying possible ways of solutions, international experiences and techniques, popularizing the idea and lobbying for it among larger audiences, including the local and federal governments, can be an excellent way of concrete NGO participation as a part of the property management. There are examples of Russian non-governmental entities, for instance the “Center for Capitalizing of Heritage” (Moscow), that engage into a full study of abandoned historic properties by evaluating their technical state, their depreciation rate, by supporting infrastructure of the area, by estimating investments and possible modes of use. In the case of the St. Petersburg property, this should be a more detailed study; however, formulating prospects and suggestions will help rise awareness of the issue and push the relevant governmental and legislative bodies. In such a case, the NGOs can implement their role as a mediator, always prioritizing heritage preservation, aimed at balancing the interests of all the key actors – government, business, politics and local community.

Lessons from the Attempt to Conserve the Architectural Heritage of Lhasa's Old Town

Pimpim de Azevedo and André Alexander, Tibet Heritage Fund



Fig. 1: Lhasa valley in 1948. From left to right, Norbulingka, Potala palace and Shoel Village under the Potala and the city proper with Jokhang in the centre. The three sites are all nominated in the Unesco World Heritage List.

Map: Tibet Heritage Fund

In 1948, the area of Lhasa consisted of 900 houses, with 700 buildings in the city proper, according to the survey made by Peter Aufschnaiter (Fig. 1). The city consisted of palaces, monasteries, temples, shrines, office buildings and residential houses, and the houses were privately owned.

In 1959, when full Communist rule was imposed on Tibet, the private houses and property, monasteries and temples were confiscated and nationalized. The use of the buildings' space and function changed, and most of them were transformed into public housing, granaries, stables etc. Even after the drastic changes, including the change of daily use of the space, lack of maintenance and neglect, the houses kept the solidity and beauty of the Lhasa architecture.

From the end of the 1950s to the 1980s, the old city did not change very much; only after Lhasa was considered to be one of China's 24 historic cities and the Lhasa 2000 masterplan was approved in 1983, the change started to be noticed (Fig. 2).

Until the end of the 1980s, new residential houses in Lhasa were built with traditional materials and techniques, with

a new arrangement of space to meet the new society's needs. Each house had individual flats, but toilets and the water tap were shared. But even this new type of house would not survive the wave of development, and most of them were also replaced with 4-storey concrete blocks, with shared toilets and one water tap.

In the 1990s, concerned with the disappearance of the old city, André Alexander founded the Lhasa Archive Project in order to document the historic buildings. Alexander prepared a booklet and sent it to UNESCO and scholars in China and around the world. This was one of the earlier efforts to raise awareness for the protection of Lhasa city.




Fig. 2: Inner city of Lhasa, the city of Lhasa grown around the Jokhang temple (KA), a Unesco World Heritage Site. Of the 700 houses surveyed in 1948, only approximately 50 remain today in the whole town.

Map: Tibet Heritage Fund

In 1994 the Potala palace was listed for nomination to the World heritage List. During that time it was hoped that not only the Potala palace as monument would be protected, but also the Shoel Village below the palace. Unfortunately, this was not the case, and following the nomination of the Potala, the Shoel village was demolished to “create tourist facilities and beautify the area” (Fig. 3).



Fig. 3: In the 1990s, approximately 35 traditional buildings were demolished per year and replaced with new four-storey houses. Photo: André Alexander / Tibet Heritage Fund

“The head of the UNESCO delegation, Minja Yang, expressed disapproval and proposed international collaboration to preserve Lhasa’s remaining historic buildings adequately, but it was not approved” (Alexander 2011-2015). Together, Alexander and Heather Stoddard networked and expressed concern to scholars, institutions and individuals, and this network led to identifying people who would support the preservation of Lhasa old town inside and outside of government offices.

As a result, in 1996 the Tibet Heritage Fund (THF), a non-governmental organization, was founded in Lhasa and was accepted by the municipal government as a partner. The municipality approved cooperation between THF and the Lhasa Construction Bureau to work together for the preservation of historic houses in Lhasa.

The first restoration project was done with a construction company, but they did not have the experience and knowledge of traditional skills, so master artisans were invited to help to complete the work. THF asked master artisans to organize a team that knew traditional building skills and understood the concept of conservation.

The following restoration projects received strong support from the Lhasa mayor who created the Lhasa Old City Protection Working Group (LOCPWG) in 1998. Lobsang Gyeltsen was the chairman with two vice-chairmen: the head of the Cultural Relics Bureau and André Alexander, the head of Tibet Heritage Fund.

At that time the responsibility for the historic houses was shifted from the Lhasa Construction Bureau to the Lhasa Cultural Relics Bureau. In the following few years, an important old neighbourhood of Lhasa was preserved and rehabilitated. During that

period, THF developed a community-based conservation approach and obtained the support of the municipal authorities for the conservation projects.

As a result of the conjunct efforts for the conservation old Lhasa, in 1998, 93 buildings were officially listed as protected. This was an important moment for the protection of the vernacular Lhasa houses.

But in August 2000, the Cultural Relics Bureau decided to terminate its cooperation with the Tibet Heritage Fund. This should not have affected either the 1990 regulations, stipulating that construction in historic Lhasa needs special permission, nor the 1998 listing of 93 historic buildings. But both the municipality and the Cultural Relics Bureau soon after gave permission for the demolition of the historically significant Ganden Khangsar building, Samtong and Jamyang Kyil. In 2001-2002, two clusters of historic buildings in the Barkor and Shasarzur neighbourhoods were demolished (Alexander 2011-2015).

In 2000 and 2003 respectively, the Potala World Heritage listing was successfully extended to include the Jokhang temple and the Norbulingka. With these important monuments listed, Lhasa’s historic city was still not included in the protection. In 2003, the UNESCO World Heritage Committee asked the Chinese authorities to review its urban development plan for Lhasa (Alexander 2011-2015).

Important efforts were made by the municipality to preserve the old city’s vernacular buildings, but these attempts have not succeeded, and out of the 93 protected buildings only 56 exist today. A report was made by China’s Central Construction and Planning Authority recommending that the old city should be preserved as a ‘historical area’, but the same recommendations also said that the old traditional buildings were ‘dangerous or unsafe housing that needed to be replaced’ (Alexander et al. 1999). This gave the developers an excuse to replace the buildings. The new buildings were built of concrete with painted cement decorations to resemble the decorations of the old buildings, and had 3-4 storeys.

Although this approach tried to save some reminiscence of the traditional architecture, the materials and techniques, spatial layout and the use of decorative motifs in the building have changed significantly.

The appeals by Minja Yang in 1994 and by the UNESCO delegation in 2003 were of little consequence for the Lhasa old town. To make things more complicated, the UNESCO delegations have limited access to Lhasa, and therefore little possibility to monitor the World Heritage Sites.

The restriction on NGOs in China and NGOs working in Lhasa and Tibet makes it impossible to have independent evaluation, approach and reports.

In 2013, as a response to the ongoing “beautification of Lhasa”, an appeal was made by Tibetan scholars to UNESCO and to President Xi Jinping, requesting to “halt the demolition of Lhasa old city”, and “that independent investigative teams from both China and from UNESCO be dispatched to Lhasa as soon as possible”.

Later in 2013, a meeting was held in Lhasa, and 11 experts on Tibetan culture from different research institutes and universities in China were invited to evaluate the renovation / beautification of Lhasa. Mr. Hua from the China Tibetology Research Center said about the renovation of Lhasa that “the original architectural style and the ethnic flavor had been preserved”.

Very often the general understanding of “conservation” in Asia is the replacement of historic structures by new buildings, with little or no resemblance to the old ones regarding design, building tech-



Fig. 4: The Tsona Tsongkhapa house, located in the north side of Barkor street, in the 1990s. The Barkor street circumbulates the Jokhang temple, a world heritage site.
Photo: André Alexander / Tibet Heritage Fund



Fig. 5: The Tsona Tsongkhapa house, under construction in 2013. In spite of the close proximity to the Jokhang temple, a UNESCO site, and the efforts to preserve the historic buildings, the approach to conserve the historic houses is still the replacement of historic buildings by new constructions.
Photo: Ken Okuma / Tibet Heritage Fund

niques or materials (Seung-jin Chung and Chang-sung Kim 2010). This causes substantial loss of historic buildings.

For example, the Barkor street in Lhasa, both a circumbulation path around the Jokhang temple (7th century), and an important market street, has been redesigned to fit some kitsch view of Tibet that may appeal to the national and international tourists. For example, street lights resembling prayer wheels have been installed, and the street sellers removed elsewhere (Fig. 4, Fig. 5). Another example of this kind of attitude is the misuse of the decorative red frieze usually used only in palaces and temples. In recent years, this type of frieze was applied without discrimination to any building, including hotels, public toilets etc.

Important efforts have been made by the government to conserve Lhasa, but still the most common approach by the construction companies is the replacement of the old buildings by new concrete buildings. This does not fit with the approach to historic towns or the UNESCO World Heritage status.

Currently, less than 60 old residential buildings remain, and it is important to ensure that these buildings are protected and preserved as original examples of Lhasa vernacular architecture.

Conclusion

To preserve the existing historic vernacular buildings it is necessary to change the present approach without delay into a conservation approach, monitored by the regional and national Cultural Relics Departments together with UNESCO to ensure that conservation objectives are met and the integrity of the World Heritage Sites preserved. Furthermore, they should give strict guidelines to ensure that the sites’ integrity and authenticity are protected.

References

- Alexander, André, and De Azevedo, Pimpim: The Old City of Lhasa - Report from a Conservation Project, Berlin: Tibet Heritage Fund, 2nd Edition, Katmandu ISBN 3-933192-01-3, 1998.
- Alexander, André, and Wermelskirch, Moritz: Tibetan Old Buildings and Urban Development in Lhasa 1948-1985-1998, Berlin: Freie Kultur Aktion, 1998.
- Alexander, A. 2011-2015: The traditional Lhasa House, Typology of an endangered species. Volume Two of Tibet Heritage Fund’s conservation Inventory. Serindia publications, Chicago.
- Seung-jin Chung and Chang-sung Kim: The Development of Attitudes to Historic Conservation - From Eurocentrism to Cultural Diversity - ARCHITECTURAL RESEARCH, Vol. 12, No. 1 (June 2010), pp. 25-32
- Guangya Zhu: China’s architectural heritage conservation movement. *Frontiers of Architectural Research* (2012) 1, 10–22, www.sciencedirect.com
- Wim Denslagen: Authenticity and Spirituality. Concepts of Authenticity in Architectural Heritage Preservation. Paper presented at an International Workshop of the Cluster of Excellence, Heidelberg University, 16 June 2008.
- http://www.petitions24.com/tibetan_scholars_appeal_to_halt_the_destruction_of_old_lhasa
- http://eng.tibet.cn/2012sy/xw/201306/t20130625_1902004.html

Civil Society Preparing for the Reconstruction of the Historic Center of Aleppo

Dr. Anette Gangler, Freunde der Altstadt Aleppos¹

Background

Aleppo is one of the oldest cities in the Middle East. The remains of the temple of the Weather God on top of the Citadel date back to the 3rd millennium BC. The Citadel and the historic center surrounding it have been listed as a World Cultural Heritage site since 1986. Many international institutions in cooperation with national institutions have been involved in the protection and revitalization of the Old City of Aleppo. A Syrian-German cooperation project called "The Rehabilitation Project of the Old City of Aleppo"



Fig. 1: View of the Citadel.

Photo: Aleppo Archive, 2009

began in 1994 and was completed in 2010. A program of the Aga Khan Foundation for the restoration of the three citadels - Salahadin, Masyaf and Aleppo – started in 1999. Part of it was an integrative planning process which included tourism development as one of the tools to improve the economic and social conditions of the inhabitants. The whole rehabilitation project for the Old City of Aleppo was initiated by the restoration of the Citadel and its surroundings, including the creation of a representative public square in front of the Citadel (Fig. 1). The Citadel and the city were destroyed in the 6th century by the Persians, and again in 1260 and 1400 by the Mongols, but perhaps these should not be compared with the destruction caused by the armed conflict today. Many historic monuments from different periods have been irre-

versibly lost, like the Mosque al Husruwiya (1566) and the entrance to the Madrasa al Sultaniya (1225) (Fig. 2).



Fig. 2: Destruction of the entrance of the Citadel.

Photo: Schahd Eian Network

Safeguarding cultural heritage with international, national and local organizations

The frontline of the armed conflict between the regime forces and the free army divides the center of Aleppo. The fighting zones are along the axes through the Old City (Fig. 3, p. 95). As the map of the center of Aleppo shows, many historic monuments from different periods have been damaged, partially destroyed or looted (Fig. 4 p. 95). According to a list presented by Thierry Grandin on June 18, 2015, around 40 international and national initiatives and NGOs are involved in helping the suffering inhabitants. A lot of organizations and NGOs share the aim of safeguarding cultural heritage. They are collecting and monitoring the damages and are starting initiatives to protect the cultural heritage sites. Some of the most active are many local non-governmental organizations like Protect Syrian Heritage (APSA), Cultural Initiatives (ASOR), Syrian Association for Preservation of Archeology and Heritage (SAPAM), and Heritage for Peace – Protection of Cultural Heritage During Armed Conflicts, and many others.

¹ Friends of the Old Town of Aleppo




Fig. 3: The frontline in the City Aleppo. Map presented in the meeting "Post-Conflict Reconstruction in the Middle East Context and in the Old City of Aleppo in particular" by T.Grandin 18.06.15




Fig. 4: Evaluation of damages and the frontline in the historic center of Aleppo. Map presented in the meeting "Post-Conflict Reconstruction in the Middle East Context and in the Old City of Aleppo in particular" by T. Grandin 18.06.15


Governmental institutions like the Syndicate of Engineers in Aleppo are also very active in safeguarding some sites in Aleppo. The General Directorate of Antiquities & Museums (DGAM) monitors the damage to Syrian cultural heritage and tries to update its webpages daily. This basic information was also used for the State Party Report to the World Heritage Committee (submitted by the

Ministry of Culture in February 2015). The DGAM is organizing training programs for experts to develop first aid to save cultural heritage buildings. They also guide the local people to be aware of the cultural heritage sites and to guard them. The DGAM also often cooperates with international organizations that are monitoring and reporting the damages.


Beside numerous national and local institutions, many international organizations (ICOMOS, ICCROM, INTERPOL, the World Customs Organization, WCO, Arab Regional Center for World Heritage, etc.), humanitarian NGOs and civil society, as well as universities, foundations or single experts and individuals have committed themselves to the preservation of Syria's cultural heritage. It is important to collect and coordinate all this information as basic documents for restoration or reconstruction of historic monuments, but also for the future sustainable urban development which includes social and economic aspects as well as the intangible heritage.

Documentation²

The documentation of destruction and damage is essential after a war-related conflict, as well as the preservation and safeguarding of written and drawn urban history. Within the framework of the Syrian-German cooperation, an Urban Historical Archive and Documentation Centre (UHADCA) was established in 2008 at the heart of Aleppo's ancient urban city center. Consequently, as a result of one and a half decades of joint Syrian-German rehabilitation work, the archive was about to complete the experience gained in the field of architecture and urban planning. This archive was also supported by the German association "Friends of the Old City of Aleppo". The collection and preservation of plans and historical



26 Original cadastral maps from 1928-1934



90 Cadastral map VIII-6-2 with Assadiyeh School, 1928/30, original scale 1:500

Fig. 5/6: Documented Sites in the historic center of Aleppo (The Aleppo Archive, 2012, p. 34 / p. 88)

² German Activities – The Association "Friends of the Old City of Aleppo"

photos have been one of the main activities in creating a digital inventory on the basis of the cadastral plans of the city of Aleppo (Fig. 5/6). The collected data should be accessible for researchers and students, but also for interested people of Aleppo.

The present condition of the Archive in Aleppo is unknown. However, a publication called "The Aleppo Archive" (2012) gives a short overview on the documented material. Nonetheless, a large amount of digital data and digitized copies of most of the archival records is available on a backup hard disk. Several entities and individuals have also stored digitized records that facilitate a systematic collection which can serve as the basis for a digitized archive at a public institution in Germany to make it again accessible. At the end of the war it should be transferred back to Aleppo.

Safeguarding the cultural heritage will be essential for future restoration and development. The coordination for archiving the collected material on a GIS database was started with the "Syrian Heritage Archive Project" initiated by the German Archaeological Institut (DAI) and the Museum of Islamic Art in Berlin in cooperation with the Brandenburg Technical University Cottbus and the association "Friends of the Old City of Aleppo". Within the scope of this project, not only are historic monuments documented but also the urban structure of the traditional quarters of the historic city and the typology of the housing. This urban fabric includes social and economic aspects and is an important part of the remaining cultural and intangible heritage. To rebuild the destroyed residential quarters and the housing stock is urgent. The UN Economic and Social Council for Western Asia (ESCWA) have reported that one third of the real estate in Syria has been destroyed by shelling: 400,000 homes have been completely destroyed and 300,000 partially destroyed. Meanwhile, infrastructure damage has affected 500,000 others.

Previous experience in the old city rehabilitation project can also be helpful to plan ahead for the future preservation and urban development. For example, the Housing Fund (1994-2008) was created to give financial support to inhabitants to restore their houses in order to stay in the Old City and to avoid social segregation. This fund was another activity supported by the association of the "Friends of the Old City of Aleppo" over a long time, and it will be one of our main objectives to contribute to providing housing for the inhabitants in the post-war reconstruction process.

The Old City of Aleppo – Strategies for Reconstruction

Post-war reconstruction involves political, social, economic, ideological, symbolic, aesthetic, financial and technical considerations. A conference in Berlin in February 2015 was initiated by a member of the association "Friends of the Old City of Aleppo", an archaeol-

ogist - Prof. Dr. Mamoun Fansa - in cooperation with AEDS (Metropolitan Laboratory) to think about strategies for reconstruction of the Old City of Aleppo and to raise general awareness of the importance of the cultural, economic, and architectural identity. Enacting a moratorium on accurately defined spatial conservation areas and formulating a Charter of Aleppo have been proposed. Moreover, the urgent need to achieve rapid re-housing and accommodation for the returnees through temporary buildings has been emphasized. A "building yard" should provide suitable building material and construction know-how. A broad-based public relations network and a close cooperation with Syrian and international experts are necessary. A second conference in Beirut should be carried out to learn more about the current local situation to support the stakeholders in Aleppo – who are also holding seminars on the city's reconstruction – in preparation for the reconstruction and to jointly develop a pro-active, flexible design that respects both the lifestyle of the people and the world cultural heritage of the 5000-year-old Old City.

Post-Conflict Reconstruction in the Middle East Context, particularly in the Old City of Aleppo

From 18-19 June 2015, a first meeting on Post-Conflict Reconstruction in the Middle East Context and on the Old City of Aleppo in particular was organized by Nada Al Hassan, Chief of the Arab States Unit of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Beside many other aspects, during the conference the need was stressed for collecting the evidence for the historic center of Aleppo, and for coordinating and transmitting existing archives and documentations in order to make them accessible. The importance of documentation of historic monuments and archaeological sites should be recognized, but, at the same time, the documentation of the transformation process of the urban fabric and vernacular architecture in the context of the complexity of the city should also be taken into consideration for sustainable development in post-war reconstruction.

Recommendations

A vision and a road map for the future is necessary to develop with the first efforts that should be made by all international and domestic parties to stop human and material losses, starting with the recognition of their historical responsibilities. All activities to save cultural heritage must start and end with the people. Heritage is built by them and used and reused by them. Heritage is also about more than just built structures, it is about the intangible beliefs and practices associated with them and the values assigned to them, as well as those which may have no material manifestation.

The Transformative Tourism Development Group and Mozambique Island

Sana Butler, Transformative Tourism Development Group

Two years ago, I met the Director of the African World Heritage Fund, Dr. Webber Ndoro. We were in Zimbabwe for the 20th Session of the United Nations World Tourism Organization General Assembly that was taking place down the street from Victoria Falls. Dr. Ndoro wanted to talk about press coverage for some of the lesser known World Heritage sites in Sub-Saharan Africa; and he gave me a copy of the book *African World Heritage: A Remarkable Diversity*. It was that 208 page book and our 30 minute conversation over coffee that set the path for this presentation today.

At the time, I had just left Newsweek after more than ten years as a luxury travel writer. But I still knew magazine editor friends who would be interested in this pitch. My initial thought was that the sites would be an easy sell; I had already reported a Newsweek UK feature on World Heritage junkies a couple of years earlier. These are people who only vacation to World Heritage sites. So I thought in addition to introductions to travel editors I could do one better: connect him to the educational travel director of the American Museum of Natural History, based in NYC. She could feature at least one of the sites on the Museum's "Histories Lost by Private Jet" itinerary. This was an 8-day trip around the world, visiting inscribed cultural sites.




Fig. 1: The ruins of Great Zimbabwe.

Photo: wikipedia.org

One suggestion I liked was the massive stone walls of Great Zimbabwe, located in the Valley of Ruins. It is thought to have covered 720 hectares and home to an ancient city-state that many considered to be the Biblical gold-rich kingdom of Ophir and the capital

of the Queen of Sheba (Ndoro, 2005). When he mentioned stone ruins, I immediately thought of Machu Picchu in Peru. The ancient Inca site generated \$35.9 million in revenue last year (Machu Picchu draws... 2014).

Then I looked at a picture of the Great Zimbabwe. And it wasn't as great as I had envisioned. The site itself was not well-maintained. There were few signs of landscaping. Shrubs everywhere; many sprouted up in the middle of stone enclosures. Trees were overgrown with many of the smaller ones brown, brittle and dying. Visitors pay attention to those kind of details.

From a holistic destination perspective, I later learned that neighboring hotels to the site had limited capacity to fill the demand of mainstream arrivals. And accommodations were, at best, 4-star. Meaning, the private jet demographic was out.

In subsequent conversation with Dr. Webber, he pointed out that the region, despite being rich in natural and cultural heritage, lacked a consistent long-term conservation finance programming. Instead of a strategic tourism master plan around each site, the search for financial resources focus on the basics: preservation and protection (AU appeals for funding to African World, 2015). And even that has been difficult to find funds to support.

But the tourism demands are changing for Sub-Saharan Africa. The region exceeded 50 million international tourist arrivals for the first time ever, reporting \$34 billion in revenue in 2013 (United Nations World Tourism Organization 2013). President Obama was in Cape Town earlier that summer in June and coined his speech, "Africa is rising" (In Cape Town, Obama says 2013). These hordes - combined with PR forces to brand a new positive image of Africa - are laying siege to some of the continent's worst images and stereotypes.

Historically, the region has been thought of as a continent of animals (Zimmerman 2014) plagued by AIDS, famine, and deep poverty. I can attest to this personally because when I first started travel writing I remember candid conversations with other writers who only felt comfortable encouraging travelers to visit the region on safari.

In this sense, World Heritage sites that specifically focus on cultural (aka manmade monuments) hold the most potential to successfully create a new, compelling global brand image of Africa. Education-based marketing of the cultural sites in Sub-Saharan Africa can unlock inspirational stories that empower the people, empower the continent and empower the global community, which is largely unaware of the region’s intellectual capacity. Take for example the impact Timbuktu in Mali has had on the world. Here is a cultural heritage site where 15th century scholarship of math, astronomy, medicine and science “benefited European scholars during the time of the European Renaissance” (Timbuktu’s Ancient Manuscripts 2012).




Fig. 2: Ancient manuscript from Timbuktu. Photo: Prince Claus Fund of the Netherlands

A preserved and protected but, most of all, visited cultural site will rewire how the international community looks at the continent and its citizens. At the forefront of the new story of Africa, the cultural sites could also build bridges of economic inclusion. They have the potential to solve the biggest problem plaguing the tourism industry today. Leakages. The UNWTO says as much as 85% of all tourism revenue in the region never reaches host communities because it is rerouted to headquarters of foreign-owned companies (Pleumarom, cited in Bolwell, Weinz 2008).

Zero leakage and 100% economic retention is possible if the upfront mission of a site is to become a self-sufficient, self-contained, community-managed visitor destination. Think UNESCO LEAP (Local Effort And Preservation) Program, amplified. The economic impact of global heritage sites in developing and emerging countries and regions can be more than \$100 million a year in visitor revenue (Saving Our Vanishing 2010).

But if the private sector was going to mobilize 100% economic retention, in my mind, it meant finding investors who would ask for nothing in return.

Two years ago, shortly after that conversation over coffee with Dr. Webber, I set out to find those rare type of private investors and to pick a pilot site for them to fund. Fast forward to now. I run a company called Transformative Tourism Development Group.



We are a newly launched conservation organization that follows a traditional for-profit business model in order to pursue a social mission. Our social mission is two

fold: to restore and upgrade inscribed cultural sites into new commercially viable World Heritage destinations and to create a factory of business incubators to develop indigenous-owned SMEs to manage the site themselves.



Fig. 3: Location of the Island of Mozambique. Map: africanworldheritagesites.org

Everything about our work is designed so that, at some point, the company slips away and local businesses are left with the political and economic power connections to thrive with a level of social capitalism only foreign investors currently enjoy in the region.

For our pilot site, I chose Mozambique Island, the country’s first and only UNESCO World Heritage Site. The former capital of colonial Portuguese East Africa boasts 129 grand architectural buildings (Jamu 2014). The fortifications were established in the 16th century, when the island was an important port on the trade route to India. The buildings reflect Portuguese styles, along strong Arabian influences.

A vast majority of the structures were destroyed in the war for independence (which ended colonial rule in 1975) (Island of Mozambique 2007). The population on the island is about 14,000 (Island of Mozambique 2007). I envisioned the island like a small Bahamas before the Caribbean was “discovered”. The island would house everything one might expect to find in a small coastal town – a marina, bed and breakfasts, spa, boutique inn, shops, museums, restaurants and coffee lounges.

The upgrade of the island, UNESCO restoration, and Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) training factory won’t happen overnight or even five years. Impact investors look for projects to fund that will first and foremost have a significant social and economic

impact. And they are in it for the long haul, okaying commitment for 10 to 15 years. For all of its promise, it is not truly understood beyond the philanthropic world. That is because impact investing is founded with the new idea that for-profit investors will sacrifice market returns in order to invest in a better world. (They also like throwing around anti-establishment words like “disrupt”, “radical” and “revolution” which are words tourism needs to reaffirm a centrality of growth.)



Fig. 4: The Church of Misericordia on Mozambique Island.

Photo: wikipedia.org

Taking a cue from the Millennium Development Goals that end this year, Transformative Tourism identified six specific and measurable development goals to achieve by 2030. But to do everything we wanted to do over the course of 15 years, we needed, in some ways, an infinite revenue stream. For that solution, I studied the business models of the most popular luxury safari lodge slash tour operator, &Beyond, formerly known as CC Africa (Conservation Corporation Africa). But instead of luxury lodges supporting wildlife initiatives, we will build luxury resorts for the sole purpose of creating revenue to empower people and places. One hundred percent of the profits from the high-end resort will fund an infinite investment stream of distributions to a Trust Fund that are predictable and consistent, at the minimum.



Fig. 5: Beach on Mozambique Island.

Photo: wikipedia.org

After Mozambique Island, I plan to mobilize financial support to preserve and revitalize UNESCO cultural heritage sites in Zimbabwe, Madagascar, and Ethiopia, which I am personally super jazzed about as it ties with Morocco as having the highest number of inscriptions in one country at nine. So if there is anyone affiliated with those or others, let's talk.

Not only is this challenge doable, but it will be a testament of what can happen across local economies – across the region – when tourism profits stay and are truly reinvested. I offer everyone in this room a challenge to join the movement to see the restoration of cultural World Heritage Sites in Sub-Saharan Africa as much more than a financial investment in monuments and architecture; but it is a quintessential opportunity to write the story of the continent right.

I may not see the fruits of this labor. I may not see imperiled sites reach and surpass their economic potential; or even touch the legacies left behind. But I don't mind. I feel in my heart we will set the path straight for the next generation and the ones after that. Travelers want to know and see the history of the cradle of civilization. Until now, they have been spooked, delayed and detoured, but not deterred.

If we re-build it, they will come.

References

- AU appeals for funding to African World Heritage Fund, 2015. Available from: <<http://www.sabc.co.za/news>>. [May 6, 2015].
- Bolwell, D. and Weinz, W. 2008, “Reducing poverty through tourism,” International Labour Office, vol.1, pp.12. Source: Does tourism benefit the third world?, A. Pleumarom, third world network, at www.twinside.org.sg/title2/resurgence/207-208/cover1.doc
- Island of Mozambique (wiki article), November 2007. Available from: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Island_of_Mozambique>. 4 January 2015.
- Jamu 2014. Interview with Hafiz Jamu. Foundation for Community Development of Mozambique Island.
- Machu Picchu draws US\$35 million in revenue annually 2014. Available from: <<http://www.peruthisweek.com/news-machu-picchu-draws-us35-million-in-revenue-annually-103199>>. [10 June 2014].
- Ndoro, W 2005. ‘The Preservation of Great Zimbabwe: Your Monument our Shrine,’ International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property. Available from: <http://www.academia.edu/11828195/The_Preservation_of_Great_Zimbabwe_Your_monument_our_shrine> [September 2005]
- Saving Our Vanishing Heritage: Value of Global Heritage, 2010. Available from: <http://globalheritagefund.org/what_we_do/value_of_global_heritage>. [19 October 2010].
- UNESCO 2006, Launch of African World Heritage Fund. Available from: <<http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/253/>> . [3 May 2006].
- Timbuktu's Ancient Manuscripts Under Threat, 2012. Available from: <<http://newafricanmagazine.com/timbuktus-ancient-manuscripts-under-threat/>>. [1 October 2012].
- United Nations World Tourism Organization 2013. Media Resources for the 20th session of the General Assembly. Available from: <<http://media.unwto.org/content/media-resources-20th-session-general-assembly>>. [August 2013].
- In Cape Town, Obama says “Africa is rising”, 2013. Available from: <<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/in-cape-town-obama-says-africa-is-rising/>> [June 30, 2013].
- Zimmerman, J. 2014. “Americans Think Africa Is One Big Wild Animal Reserve,” New Republic 8 July 2014. Available from: <<http://www.newrepublic.com/article/118600/america-must-stop-stereotyping-africa-continent-animals>>



Monuments

Moderator: Dr. Christina Cameron
(University of Montreal)

The Role of Civil Society in Safeguarding Georgia's World Heritage. Challenges and Outcomes

Manana Tevzadze, National Committee of the Blue Shield, Georgia

As state budgets all across the globe are becoming scarcer and demands of heritage conservation are rising, more and more activities in the heritage sector are undertaken by civil society organizations (CSOs). Such activism is not always limited to providing financial support. While as a result of the active work of CSOs, more and more donor or private funds are being spent on heritage awareness and preservation, civil society contribution to the preservation of heritage is far beyond a financial one.

Civil Society and the Heritage Sector

The development of civil society with an interest in the heritage field is a separate topic of interest in itself. Some believe that the beginnings of the modern civil society movement for heritage can be found in the so called "Hamkaris" – craftsmen unions that existed in the 18-19th c. and contributed significantly to the rebuilding of Tbilisi after the devastating fire of 1795. In the late 19th and early 20th c. the so called "Tergdaleuli" - a generation of western educated Georgians - also formed civil society groups and advocated for educational and cultural issues. First historical, ethnographic and archaeological societies were created then.

During the very short life of Georgia's first republic (1918-1921), civil society saw its development, too. In the period between then and modern day independent Georgia there was an interrupted development – the Soviet regime which did not leave much space for the development of the civil sector. Early signs of a civil sector emerged in the 1980s – in the final decade of the Soviet Union. A prominent public protest campaign for heritage was the one opposing the "Soviet Army's shooting practice near the historic David Gareji Monastery, which caused damage to the latter" (Nodia 2005).

With independence, many NGOs emerged, some directly with heritage issues on their agenda. Nonetheless, most of them encountered either sustainability problems or were inconsistent and soon ceased to exist. Only a couple of such NGOs has remained and still continues to be active today. Since the past five years we can observe a significant activation of civil society in the heritage sector.

The early stage of NGO activism in the heritage sector (from the 1990s to 2010) can be characterized as more or less donor driven, thus top down. In this period of establishment of the heritage NGO sector, about a dozen organizations were founded and undertook their work that concerned preservation, restoration and urban revitalization activities. The second stage (from around 2009 till present) can be called the emergence of real grassroots heritage CSOs which have been created mostly as a result of case by case campaigns to protect certain heritage sites or objects against certain developments (urban, environmental, infrastructural mega projects like construction of a hydro-electric power station or a mega business center right in the middle of the historic district, etc.).

Tiflis Hamkari, Monument's Friend, Civil Initiative, Non-governmental Monitoring of Cultural Heritage, Eastern Partnership Arts and Culture Council – are all among the newly emerged NGOs, while movements and campaigns, such as Save Bagrati Cathedral, Green Fist, Save Gudiashvili Square, Guerilla Gardening, Save Sakdrisi Ancient Gold Mine (Fig. 1) have all been connected to cases for the safeguarding of specific cultural or natural heritage sites and environments.



Fig. 1: Public protest campaign against gold-mining in the Sakdrisi Ancient Gold Mine heritage site.

Photo: ICOMOS Georgia

Activism of both of these groups is driven by a common general challenge – the poor state of heritage conservation in Georgia, and the neglect of heritage values by the authorities. This challenge has several core reasons, which are: Lack of a national policy for her-

itage, lack of heritage professionals in the decision-making circles, lack of awareness of heritage values among the wider public, and an ineffective heritage management system.

Civil Society and World Heritage Sites of Georgia

Among the noteworthy efforts and activities of CSOs in the heritage sector, action has always been taken to protect Georgia's three world heritage sites which have been inscribed since 1994. The rationale of the civil society for this action is quite simple. Apart from valuing the past as a source of identity and belonging, Georgia as a young democracy and country in transition has to make use of its few communication channels with the outside world, and the World Heritage List is one such instrument.

The nomination of the first three Georgian sites for the UNESCO WH List was undertaken by the state agency while the role of individual professionals in their preparation has been immense. After the successful nomination, another two sites were nominated in 2000 (Tbilisi Historic District and Vardzia-Khertvisi Historical Area), but their listing was deferred.

The most prominent example of civil society activism for the protection of a World Heritage is the campaign to protect the Bagrati Cathedral. The Bagrati Cathedral, together with the Gelati Monastery, has been listed since 1994. In 2009 the government embarked on a large-scale project which it claimed to be a reinforcement of the ruin. Soon it became evident, however, that the 11th century cathedral, ruined in the 17th century, was being prepared for a full reconstruction. A public campaign was initiated by a few heritage professionals – members of ICOMOS Georgia – and succeeded in attracting an initial 7,000 members on the



Fig. 2: October 2009. A team of experts and officials inspecting the reconstruction works on Bagrati Cathedral after they had been stopped as a result of public campaign.
Photo: ICOMOS Georgia

campaign's facebook page "Save Bagrati Cathedral". The group demanded the works to stop and claimed that it would cause irreversible damage to the monument, leading to the loss of its values and consequently the World Heritage status. The campaign published a petition acquiring public signatures and addressed the state and church authorities with it. An appeal was also spread internationally among heritage organisations and professionals.

The success of the campaign in the initial phase was that the case attracted much media attention. The story of controversial works on a world heritage site, supported by the state authorities, church and professionals on one side and opposed by another group of professionals on the other, created the setting in which the head of the Orthodox Church of Georgia, (the most trustworthy individual for Georgian citizens according to the polls) demanded that the state stop the works.

Later the works were resumed, and the cathedral was reconstructed and inaugurated in 2012, causing irreversible damage to its authenticity and values. The chronology of WHC decisions regarding the site has been the following:

- 2010 – listing on the Danger List and proposing a rehabilitation strategy;
- 2011 – using a very soft language showing little concern that the proposed strategy is not implemented;
- 2012 - Adjourning the discussion. Formal reason unknown. What, if not a political decision?
- 2013 – The site has lost its values. (UNESCO World Heritage Center):
"... considers that the Bagrati Cathedral has been altered to such an extent that its authenticity has been irreversibly compromised and that it no longer contributes to the justification for the criterion for which the property was inscribed;...

Despite the fact that the Bagrati Campaign did not reach its final goal, it can still be considered as a successful campaign in terms of mobilizing the public and increasing the awareness and visibility of world heritage issues among the wider public and media on the national level.

Internationally the civic campaign described above did not get any reaction from either UNESCO or ICOMOS International, while the UNESCO WH Centre took a formal approach and reacted only after the planned mission. In the texts of the WH Committee Decisions one can also see that the UNESCO WH Centre position has not been clear from the outset and the Decisions have been inconsistent.

While on the example of this case and the usual practice one can say that CSOs are not considered as stakeholders by UNESCO and ICOMOS, there is hope that as a result of civil society activism changes in the regulation can be made to achieve increased legitimacy of decision-making which on its part could increase the role of civil society in the WH decision-making.

Apart from the case of Bagrati Cathedral, CSO activism has also been concerned with other sites on the WH List and on the tentative list of Georgia. The ancient monuments of Mtskheta, also on the WH List and on the List of WH in Danger since 2009 have been on the World Monuments Fund's list of 100 most endangered heritage sites in 2006 and received funding for thorough documentation of the buildings and a study of the original construction and consequent interventions as a result of the work of CSOs. Similarly, Tbilisi Historic District (on the tentative list and nominated in 2001) was also on the latter list in 1998, 2000 and 2002 as a result of the work of the civil sector. Through this and the campaign "SOS Old Tbilisi" in 2000, problems of the preservation of Tbilisi's Historic District have been brought to the attention of the wider public, donors and authorities (Fig. 3). More recent activities relate to Mtskheta where in the framework of two projects funded by the European Commission and implemented by local NGOs, public awareness seminars have been held for local school children.



Fig. 3: Demonstration of the public campaign "PaNOrama" opposing the "Panorama Tbilisi Project".
Photo: ICOMOS Georgia

The bottom-up approach mentioned earlier is also evident in relation to the WH site Historical Monuments of Upper Svaneti. Due to its very remote location, Svaneti has often remained off the route of UNESCO monitoring missions and has turned into a development hot-spot in recent years. Rush modernization of the place into a new tourism Mecca has led to serious breaches in the preservation of the site's architecture, authenticity and setting. While the centrally based CSOs have not managed to campaign actively against these developments, a local community group - the Svaneti Heritage Group - is actively trying to raise the issues and make them heard through the use of social media.

While characterizing civil society engagement with heritage issues in Georgia, one should not neglect the general context in which this activism has been developing. The past and present difficult socio-economic environment as well as the political past – the lack of such skills from the Soviet period – still preconditions the extent of civic activism. Civic education in the secondary education level is still very low. A challenge to the success of civil society in the heritage sector is also the neglect of the role of civil society by the state.

Conclusions

While most of the campaigns have not succeeded in achieving their direct goals, they all have had tangible results becoming evident in a timespan of 2-3 years. We can say that the campaigns, albeit not immediately successful, have led to a better coordinated civil society, to the diversification and emergence of new groups, to the emergence of the heritage issue on the agenda of a wider NGO platform, and most importantly, to the refining of the law enforcement system in the heritage sector of Georgia.

A challenge on a wider scale remains the lack of recognition of heritage as a resource of social and economic development by society. Another challenge is the neglect by the state of civil society. Although CSOs get more attention and support from the international community compared to state authorities, the sector could still strongly benefit from an increased support from international donor organisations for the activity of grassroots CSOs and from the recommendations on behalf of the international community/donors to the state to increase its consideration of the civil society sector.

References

- Nodia, Ghia 2005, *Civil Society Development in Georgia: Achievements and Challenges*, Policy Paper, Caucasus Institute for Peace, Democracy and Development, Tbilisi.
- UNESCO World Heritage Committee Decisions available from <<http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/5009>> [5 July 2015]
- World Monuments Fund available from <<http://www.wmf.org/project/jvari-monastery>> [20.06.2015]
- Svaneti heritage group comments available from <<https://www.facebook.com/mariambakacho.khatchvani/posts/984407174936946>> [20.06.2015]

Touristic Reconstruction in Plovdiv, Bulgaria, in the Run-up to be a European Capital of Culture

Konstantina Pehlivanova

For seventy years now UNESCO has been fighting to protect the authenticity of human knowledge and achievements against detrimental influence. The obstacles ahead are generally defined as external forces; however, I believe the greatest threat is internal and is, namely, indifference. Independent and aware, civil organisations are often the first to discern unacceptable interventions and react. Such is also the case in Plovdiv, Bulgaria, where decisions of the local administration threaten to change the cultural essence of the city. The long-preserved credo of authenticity is to be substituted with mere entertainment.

Two centuries after the era of Viollet-le-Duc and more than twenty-five years after Bulgaria's transition to democracy, we are now witnessing a somehow anachronistic and alarming phenomenon – hypothetical reconstructions on frail archeology. The beginning of this process can be traced back to the 1930s when the first emblematic reconstruction was implemented in the town of Veliko Tarnovo. This political assignment was meant to highlight Bulgaria's past and present glory. With its accession to the European Union in 2007, Bulgaria gained access to substantial funding programs that were meant to safeguard our cultural heritage. Unfortunately, most resources were invested in construction works and not in restoration. Archeological ruins were no longer interesting or important enough. Massive structures were built upon the remains, and all too often were meant to replace the original (Fig. 1).

It was also not uncommon to witness simultaneous construction works and archeological excavations. The projects introducing such actions offer no thorough documentation of the original archaeology; nor do they provide any objective evidence of the original design. Their concept is at odds with all internationally acknowledged principles of scientific restoration, and is in violation of basic standard-setting documents for heritage preservation – the Venice Charter, the Nara Document on Authenticity and the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, all of which have been ratified by Bulgaria long ago. Moreover, they do not fit in Bulgaria's long tradition of good conservation practice of Hellenistic and Roman monuments, Thracian heritage, medieval and National Revival architecture.

Relying on media support, high levels of unemployment, and lack of general knowledge on cultural heritage, proponents of these reconstructions promise unseen tourist flow and economic growth. So far realised only in provincial towns, these new “national symbols” are irreversibly changing the landscape and only temporarily stirring local economy. The political support and financial interest behind these reconstructions are so strong that several such projects have been identified as governmental priorities. Their area of impact now extends to some of the largest Bulgarian cities.

The case I would like to present is Plovdiv – the city honored as one of the two European Capitals of Culture (ECC) for 2019. The Ancient Plovdiv Reserve – an area in the heart of the contemporary urban fabric – has been on Bulgaria's World Heritage Tentative list

TRAPEZITSA HILL, VELIKO TARNOVO



^
before



after
v

Fig. 1: Trapezitsa Hill in Veliko Tarnovo before and after reconstruction.

Photo: ICOMOS

since 2004. The site is remarkable for its multilayered history and outstanding architectural examples.

The highest concentration of historical strata lies within the archaeological complex Nebeth tepe (Fig. 2, 3). A territory of 8000 sq.m. that holds evidence of continuous human presence from the Pre-historic era up to the 20th century, this complex is crucial to the genesis of Plovdiv. It consists of several fortification walls, bastions, a tower, a water reservoir, a grain store, and other structures. Traces of an ancient public building and a Thracian sanctuary have also been documented. Throughout the last century the site has undergone two major conservation campaigns. Its condition is currently unsatisfactory due to poor maintenance. However, there is still a high level of authenticity and integrity.



Fig. 2: Aerial view of Nebeth Tepe, Plovdiv.

Photo: G. Ropova




Fig. 3: The archeological site of Nebeth Tepe, Plovdiv.

Plan: Proykova Architects

The structures in situ have great cultural significance as a source of information for both scholars and citizens. Located on a hill, freely accessible and offering a magnificent view, Nebeth tepe is

a symbol of Plovdiv, recognized by locals and by tourists. In 2014 the municipal administration expressed an intention to build a new city icon: “The Citadel of Philippopolis” was conceived – a large-scale fictitious fortress that disregarded the complexity of the site (Fig. 4, 5). The project was adopted as part of the national reconstruction campaign to achieve historic retribution and promote the local economy.

Simultaneously, another process had entirely absorbed Plovdiv – its application for the ECC. One of the strategic aims of the city was formulated as “plugging into Europe”. This brings us to the present day, when Plovdiv is the setting of two totally discrepant ideologies which the local administration strives to combine – the one that looks towards European standards and the one that ignores European practices and documents. The lack of information and transparency on decision-making triggered deep social concern. The municipality agreed to organise a public discussion on the matter of Nebeth tepe. However, the debate took place after the project had already been commissioned and approved by the Ministry of Culture.

The recently gained title of ECC 2019 had given the citizens an additional feeling of confidence and of higher responsibilities towards their home and all Europe. They united and reacted strongly in opposition. Both professionals and non-professionals displayed remarkable sensitivity to the authenticity of their city and expressed concerns that non-scientific interventions would inevitably compromise its Outstanding Universal Value. For the time being, until the municipal elections in autumn 2015, no further information on the project is expected. Still, two major conclusions came out of this discussion:

1. Administrative representatives are often not thoroughly familiar with UNESCO’s values, functions and documents. It is questionable whether governmental ambitions extend beyond the Tentative List, and whether the Bulgarian State is aware of the consequences and responsibilities that this list engenders;
2. Citizens demonstrated more in-depth knowledge on international documents and legislation than administrative representatives.

The case of Nebeth tepe exceeds the local scale. The project’s realisation would mark a turning point in Bulgarian restoration history; it would jeopardise the cultural landscape of a territory labelled as a European Capital of Culture; and it would also affect a potential World Heritage site. The importance of this fact did not remain unnoticed. We realised that the only means we had to save our heritage are

civil awareness and international assistance. Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) began to awaken; declarations, petitions, and information materials were disseminated. When governments

are irresponsible, citizens may gain attention by involving influential international organisations. In April 2015, Bulgaria received assistance from ICOMOS with a recommendation towards governmental authorities to discontinue hypothetical reconstructions. Furthermore, ICOMOS offered cooperation to assess present damages and build relevant expertise in the field. Nevertheless, the document remained somehow unnoticed by its official recipients. In May 2015 fourty organisations, including educational facil-

ities, NGOs and professional organisations, gathered at a national conference entitled "Cultural Heritage – Authenticity at Risk" and established a CULTURAL HERITAGE FORUM. Its purpose is to unite interested parties in their struggle to establish dialogue with authorities for sustainable preservation and against heritage profanation. Plovdiv's motto for 2019 – TOGETHER – should now inspire the Bulgarian citizens and represent the whole country.

THE CITADEL OF PHILIPPOLIS – AUTHENTICITY vs CONJECTURE




Fig. 4: Planned hypothetical reconstruction at Nebeth Tepe - the so-called "Citadel of Phillippopolis".

Plan: Farkov

ities, NGOs and professional organisations, gathered at a national conference entitled "Cultural Heritage – Authenticity at Risk" and established a CULTURAL HERITAGE FORUM. Its purpose is to unite interested parties in their struggle to establish dialogue with authorities for sustainable preservation and against heritage profanation. Plovdiv's motto for 2019 – TOGETHER – should now inspire the Bulgarian citizens and represent the whole country.

Dissemination of inadequate information is instrumental to controlling social opinion. Therefore, access to objective information would be the way to oppose manipulation. Nebeth tepe is a project conducted in total public obscurity. Being a ECC in 2019 is a wonderful opportunity for Bulgaria to rethink its cultural belonging within a larger context. The application that gained us the Commission's vote consists of many conceptual projects that have yet to be implemented. Now, the role of professionals is to inform citizens. And our role as citizens is to remind the elected few that information is a right and not a privilege.

Contemporary Bulgarian legislation confines cultural heritage preservation to a pyramidal structure. The Ministry of Culture simultaneously approves, monitors and censors the process. Municipalities assign projects and then control their execution with no transparency.

In their search for a more horizontal and inclusive approach, the citizens of Plovdiv established a Public Council for Culture and Cultural Heritage. The Council aims at working with local authorities to ensure access to information and social debate on important projects. Applying the principles of democracy – open structure, regular rotation of representatives and transparency – the Council should remain an independent civil initiative.

The Bulgarian government has not adopted a National Cultural Heritage Strategy yet, which leads to chaotic and ineffective institutional action. The Bulgarian campaign for hypothetical reconstructions is entitled "A Fortress for Each Town". In this situation, our cultural heritage has lost its documentary and instructive function. It is not being considered as a source of identity and collective memory. Tourist attractions substituted for authenticity. This process results in identical landscapes that rather support the motto "Divided in uniformity" – the exact opposite of the European Union motto. Plovdiv has agreed to implement a number of cultural and infrastructural projects by 2019, but the city cannot dissociate itself from the larger context. We are now facing a discrepancy between national and international aspirations.

When such basic conflicts arise, society should reconsider its role.

To clarify the local background, I should mention that the formation of civil society is a rather new phenomenon in Bulgaria. It started few decades ago against the overbuilding of the seaside and the mountains. Needless to say, those efforts were not fully rewarded, and private market interests overwhelmed our nature. Even so, these initial attempts were fundamental. Growing a thinking and active society is a slow process built by many successive generations, and every problem we attend to nurtures evolution in the long run.

Nature conservation and heritage preservation movements involve different active parties. The struggle for an authentic heritage is far more obscure to the vast majority of people because it tackles identity issues under the veil of patriotism. Nature's universal importance, on the other hand, is indisputably recognised by various social groups. What unites us all in our civil outrage is that the values we defend are treated exclusively as sources of financial income. The obstacles we share with the movement for nature preservation are lack of information and of response. Therefore, we often make substantial efforts to inform and educate ourselves on legal matters. Both causes pursue one common goal – to pro-

THE CITADEL OF PHILIPPOLIS – AUTHENTICITY vs CONJECTURE




Fig. 5: Planned hypothetical reconstruction at Nebeth Tepe – the so-called “Citadel of Phillipopolis”.

Plan: Farkov

tect authenticity. The same concept underlies international documents in the field of preservation. However, these documents only offer aspects to consider and no unique interpretation.

Cultural heritage preservation requires expertise, but it should not be confined to professional circles. It also demands time. In that respect, society is a leading actor because it measures time with generations, whereas authorities often measure it with administrative time frames.

Civil society organisations act as a corrective to authorities, and their greatest asset is their independence. I would offer the following recommendations to strengthen their impact:

1. Reinforcing practical assistance through funding and access to educational programs;
2. Increasing platforms where civil representatives can reach an international audience;
3. Ensuring access to detailed information on any project for the Tentative List or World Heritage property by demanding a responsible and transparent approach from their custodians.

For now we have only succeeded in introducing the topic of cultural heritage to the attention of Bulgarian society. The essence of the problem is still disturbingly unintelligible but we believe to someday walk the path of evolution through interpretation, understanding, appreciation and protection. I remain hopeful that Bulgarian civil society has awakened, is active, and will be far more influential in the future. Until then, however, a vast amount of authenticity may be lost. Therefore, I urge the international community not to remain indifferent to our efforts and to the obliteration of our common heritage.

References

- Selection of the European Capital of Culture in 2019 in Bulgaria. The Selection Panel's Final Report, 2014. Available from: http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/documents/ecoc/2019/report-bulgaria_en.pdf
- Australia ICOMOS 2013, The Burra charter. The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, Burwood
- Hessel, Stéphane 2012, Indignez-vous (Time for outrage), 15th edn., Indigène éditions, France
- Tilden, Freeman 2007, Interpreting our heritage, 4th edn., The University of North Carolina Press, United States of America

Intensive Urban Development Surrounding the Cathedral of St. Sofia of Kyiv, Ukraine

Igor Lutsenko, Zberezhy Staryy Kyiv¹

Dear colleagues,

I represent the non-governmental organizations and initiatives which are engaged in the protection of historical and cultural heritage in Kyiv. We are extremely concerned about the situation regarding the state of conservation of the World Heritage in our city.

We note with alarm that the most pessimistic prognosis mentioned in the 2009 and 2013 joint ICOMOS/UNESCO mission reports on the panorama along the Dnieper River and the Saint Sophia Cathedral's buffer zone is becoming a reality, as tall buildings are being constructed even inside the regulated areas. Despite repeated requests by the Committee, no moratorium has been imposed on all high-rise buildings that may have a negative effect on the panorama along the Dnieper River and the Saint Sophia Cathedral.

The State of Conservation Report and the Draft Decision of the 38th WHC Session are available on the official site <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc/2837>. Regarding this draft decision, we consider it necessary to provide the World Heritage Centre with the following information:

1. The lack of protection and planning mechanisms has reached an alarming level. No progress has been made by the authorities or those particularly concerned with the conservation projects. All "positive changes" mentioned in the SOC Report remain only in writing, without implementation. There are also no positive developments in the legislative acts. A moratorium on all high-rise and non-conforming buildings in the buffer zone of the Property, which was reported as approved by the Ministry of Culture and under consideration by the Kyiv City Council in 2012, has not been adopted. In fact, the draft Moratorium has never been included in the agenda of the Kyiv City Council sessions and has not been voted on. The draft legislation imposing a moratorium on high-rise development within the property and buffer zone has been introduced to the *Verkhovna Rada* (National Parliament) several months ago, yet there seems to be no chance that it will be approved and accepted by all the ministries concerned.

2. In spite of repeated requests by the Committee and the Advisory Bodies to halt the construction of a 150m building located at 7 Klovsy Descent, and to reduce its adverse effect by demolishing constructed levels to an appropriate scale, the building was still completed. We consider the offer made by the city authorities to reduce its evidently strong negative impact on the outstanding universal value of the property by the design of "a plan for a creative lighting effect" inadequate and ineffective.
3. The construction of a new 3-storey building continues at the territory of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra; about 100 piles 10 metres in depth have already been set (Fig. 1).




Fig. 1: New construction in the immediate vicinity of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra.

Photo: Irina Nikiforova

4. Contrary to the recommendations of ICOMOS and UNESCO, and after repeated requests, the construction of a huge 10-storey building with an underground parking lot at 17-23 O. Gonchara St., 60 metres from the Saint Sophia Reserve, is almost completed (Fig. 2).
5. The construction of an office building with an underground parking lot on the remains of the ancient foundations of Prince Volodymyr Palace at 3-5 Desyatynny Lane, in the buffer zone of the Saint Sophia Cathedral, continues at an accelerated pace (Fig. 3).

¹ Save Old Kyiv



Fig. 2: Construction of an inappropriate building at 17-23 O. Gonchara St.

Photo: Irina Nikiforova



Fig. 3: Construction of a new building that has begun at 3-5 Desyatynny Lane.

Photo: Irina Nikiforova

- The construction of a high-rise building with a 2-storey underground parking lot at 9/11 Striletska St., which is 20 metres from the Saint Sophia Reserve, is predicted to begin soon.

And the list continues.

Despite repeated requests by the Committee, the full information on these and other development proposals and the status of their approval was not provided by the State Party prior to the beginning of the construction works, in accordance with Article 172 of the Operational Guidelines.

We also would like to underline the fact that the uncontrolled construction of high-rise buildings with underground parking lots in the Saint Sophia buffer zone has resulted in a rise of groundwater level on the territory of the reserve. Experts warn that in the near future the groundwater level may reach its critical point, and this can lead to the deformation and destruction of the foundation of the cathedral and its bell tower.

It is also important to point out that besides the high-rise building at 7 Klovisky Descent, which has a strong negative influence on the outstanding universal value of the property, there are up to 50 other land plots that have been offered to investment companies for construction projects in the buffer zone of the Saint Sophia Cathedral (Fig. 4). The Kyiv NGOs have provided all relevant information to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

We strongly believe that this fact deserves to be mentioned in the Draft Decision and discussed during the 39th Committee session as well.

It seems that the former Kyiv authorities together with the Ministry of Culture and the National Commission for UNESCO in Ukraine, as well as some of the staff from the Sector of Europe and North America in the World Heritage Centre, either are not interested in discussing the problem or are incompetent. As a side note, we informed the World Heritage Centre that some of the personnel, who still hold their positions, tried to facilitate the approval of the construction project for the investor at 17-23 Gonchara St. using some Russian “experts”.

As of today, the Urban Master Plan has been completed but was approved neither by the professional nor by the civic community, and we are concerned that all those controversial land allocations will be included in the new Master Plan, thus legalized.

Considering the current events in Ukraine and the unprecedented changes our country is going through in order to become a civilized and law-abiding society, we are doing everything possible in order to change the situation concerning the protection of cultural heritage in Ukraine for the better.

To support the new Ukrainian Government in its intentions to preserve our history and culture and to improve the situation in Kyiv, the Committee can provide the State Party clear and strict recommendations on the matter.

The community of Kyiv requests the Committee to open the discussion of Property 527 “Kyiv: Saint Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra” at the 39th Committee Session.

We ask the Committee to introduce the regime of Reinforced Monitoring for the Property and its buffer zone. We also ask the Committee to recommend to the State Party the following:

- **To halt immediately** all construction projects in the buffer zone of the Saint Sophia Cathedral (17-23 O. Gonchara St. and 3-5 Desyatynny Lane) and the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra (2/34 Riznitska St.), and to impose a moratorium on high-rise buildings and inappropriate constructions within the historical centre.
- **To implement an immediate moratorium** on the construction and exploitation of underground parking lots and other objects requiring the consumption of great amounts of water in the zones of severe hydro-geological control of the Saint Sophia Cathedral and the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, in order to improve the hydro-geological situation within the territory of the Property.
- **To reduce the height** of all non-conforming and dissonant buildings to an appropriate scale by demolishing already constructed levels within the buffer zone of the Saint Sophia Cathedral (17-23 O. Gonchara St.) and the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra (7 Klovsky Descent, 2/34 Riznitska st.) which threaten or may have a negative impact on the outstanding universal value of the Property and compromise the panorama of historical monastic landscape of the right bank of the Dnieper river.
- **To provide the Committee**, in line with Article 172 of the Operational Guidelines, all detailed information on major restoration projects or new constructions in the buffer zone of the Property by 1 February 2016, to be used for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th Session in 2016.
- **To encourage the State Party** to organize a special Board of Representatives or a Technical Review Committee, comprised of the representatives of the national authorities, city administrators, site managers and representatives of civil society and NGOs, aiming at reviewing all land allocations and major construction projects in the buffer zone of the Object and, if necessary, to impose a veto on such developments.

We believe that such recommendations will encourage the new Ukrainian Government to develop a national strategy for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Ukraine, including the strengthening of cultural protection, legislation and reinforcement of the management system and, as a result, the improvement of the protection of our cultural and historical heritage.

Construction projects in the buffer zone of the Saint Sophia Cathedral




Fig. 4: New construction sites in the buffer zone of the property.

Map: Irina Nikiforova

Appropriation of Cultural Heritage by the Local Population on the Example of Belarusian Castles

Dr. Stsiapan Stureika, European Humanities University

There are about 38 castle ruins, castle-type palaces and castle archeological sites in Belarus that are still predominantly neglected. These objects could become powerful cultural assets for sustainable development of local areas and especially small towns and villages where they are situated. This is especially relevant for small and stagnant towns like Mir, Kreva, Halsany, Ruzany etc. where castles are important cultural objects with a core position for local identity. These shrinking towns have lost about half of their population in the recent 30 years, and suffer from a lack of social services and infrastructure. Conservation and revitalization

romantic idea of castles as highpoints of Belarusian culture, especially the medieval era when Belarus was a part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Conservation and museum professionals in big cities inspired this national movement. Public forces requested the full-scale rebuilding of national symbols as soon as possible. However, the state budget allowed such expenses only in recent years under both nationalistic pressure and strong economic need in tourism development.

The conservation of Mir (Fig. 1) and Niasviž (Fig. 2) castles has become a signature piece in the above-mentioned state programme. Despite the fact that it took more than 25 (Mir) and 10 (Niasviž) years respectively, these castles became national conservation projects and were even successfully nominated for the World Heritage List that turned them into a leading Belarusian visitor destination. These projects, although criticized by conservation professionals, are widely seen today as models for future restorations. However I would argue that the current optimism is premature. While patriots are aesthetically satisfied with the result, the social dimension of conservation is still absent from the accounts.



Fig. 1: Mir Castle as a part of World Heritage is experiencing a huge flow of tourists.

Photo: Wikipedia

of heritage sites can be a tool for the improvement of living standards, diversification of opportunities and life strategies, strengthening of local identity and establishment of sustainable communities.

Poor living conditions and the need for tourism development have become one of the main reasons for the rise of architectural renovation in such settlements. During the last 15 years, several state-sponsored investment programs have been launched. In particular, the state programme “Castles of Belarus” (2012–2018), targeting 38 architectural objects (Actions of State Program, 2011), has been adopted and is currently being realised. The government is also encouraging private investment into the restoration of historical sites. Another main reason for castle conservation projects is the rise of a national movement in post-soviet Belarus, and the

In 2014, inspired by new research on community-based and integrative conservation (Edson 2004; Hodges, Watson 2000; Holmes 2003; Hung 2011; Pendlebury 2004), an interdisciplinary team of Belarusian researchers have piloted the “Castles of Belarus” monitoring programme and published the research results titled “Conservation of Belarusian Castles as a Social and Cultural Project” (Stureika 2014). We covered 11 most outstanding Belarusian castle sites: Mir, Niasviž, Kreva, Halsany, Byhau, Smalyany, Navahrudak, Hrodna, Kamianec, Ruzhany and Lida. The research, which was done with active involvement of all stakeholders of castles conservation and development, has revealed and summarized the most urgent needs and challenges related to the rehabilitation of cultural heritage sites. The project team has had consultations with Belarusian architects, conservators, developers and relevant CSOs, and defined new opportunities for their involvement in the decision-making process.



Fig. 2: Niasviž Palace is one of the leading tourist destinations in Belarus. Photo: Wikipedia

We identified key groups of stakeholders and explored their most common attitudes toward conservation. They are:

- The Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Architecture, and Ministry of Finances. Although they possess financial resources, there are discrepancies and contradictions in their norms and regulations related to heritage and its development.
- Local and regional authorities, and in particular their culture departments. They can be loyal to projects as they are generally interested in investments. However they don't possess a methodology for the estimation of tourist incomes and dynamics of living standards in the area. Most often they don't see connections between conservation, social and economical issues at all.
- Local creative industries (artists, museums and knights festivals' movements) and business (cafes, souvenirs, hostels) are interested in new clients and financial resources. They are ready to invest in the development of local infrastructure but cannot contribute into conservation itself.
- A few local heritage conservation funds and national CSOs (e.g. the Belarusian Society for the Protection of Monuments, the Belarusian Culture Fund) are interested in heritage preservation and internationally approved professional conservation as well as in contracts with the state and private investors.
- Local communities, cultural and environmental organizations are mostly interested in heritage conservation from the perspective of local infrastructure development and environment protection. However, conservation itself does not contribute to the creation of such communities. The only communities it inspires are clubs of medieval knight culture and schoolchildren local history clubs in particular cities. Unfortunately they are the weakest stakeholders.
- Citizens of castle towns mostly underestimate ruins; do not see them as something important, and express a lack of personal connection to monuments. To launch a mechanism of appropriation of castles we need to catalyze the establishment of social ties with them. Conservation and utilization of castles have to become a step toward integration of local communities.

An analysis of the existing state of the arts shows that, despite some positive attempts and activities in heritage conservation, there are still serious issues and challenges in the field:

1. In Belarus there is no practice of a holistic approach in decision-making concerning the development of historical territories. Public administrations have relatively well-functioning techniques of planning and implementation of policies towards residential areas or individual monuments; however, there is a lack of these for valuable cultural landscapes and ensembles of heritage sites.
2. There is a gap between the interests of different ministries. The legislation of the Ministry for Architecture, regulating territorial development, often neglects the issues of heritage preservation. In turn, the acts of the Ministry for Culture, regulating the conservation of individual monuments, are not connected with overall territorial development projects. Local authorities in turn base their decisions on these contradicting norms and, hence, they lead to professional conflicts and social tension. As a result, restoration projects last for years (and even decades!) and do not bring significant/desirable benefits to locals. Citizens of such shrinking cities see the restoration of monuments as ineffective projects hampering the natural territorial development. In the end, such practice discredits the importance of heritage preservation.
3. The quality and intensity of activities directed at heritage conservation are being continuously criticized by experts who are concerned about the methodology of heritage conservation. Almost all conservation/revitalization projects are being accompanied by such professional conflicts.
4. Restoration projects do not always match the cultural and economic interests of local residents. Local communities and even local authorities are sometimes excluded from decision-making processes in heritage conservation. This is primarily a problem of ownership, as many heritage objects belong to neither local communities nor the local authorities and are managed on regional or national level (the case of Mir). In other words, non-locals from large cities take decisions on their development.
5. Local communities may have some, but not sufficient intellectual resources to take care of their heritage objects, and they need external intellectual, cultural and financial investments. However, the involvement of external resources not only provides a chance to preserve the heritage, but also threatens local ownership of the objects. This leads to an absence of dialogue and coordination between local and external stakeholders when their interests are not mutually respected.
6. The conservation of heritage in Belarus does not include a socio-cultural component, which is so important for the sustainability of objects and landscapes in both mid-term and long-term perspectives. Moreover, restoration projects neglect existing functions, scenarios and context of object usage. Develop-

ment of conservation projects as integral elements of a cultural landscape master plan starts to be practiced by some individual architects. However, official norms regulating the process are not yet in place. Some notes about the insufficiency of social/cultural uses of heritage were made even in the UNESCO Periodic Reports on Mir (World Heritage Centre, Periodic Report - Section II-Mir Castle 2014) and Niasviž (World Heritage Centre, Periodic Report - Section II-Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex 2014).

- When the social component in conservation acts is missing, social inclusion norms are also neglected. Even those few mechanisms that are present in the Belarusian legislation – like the Aarhus Convention that envisages obligatory public hearings related also to the restoration of heritage – are not observed. The need for the solution of these issues has to lead to a broad cooperation between local initiatives and professional CSOs, providing norms and practical mechanisms for civic participation.



Fig. 3: Places like Halsany Castle have big untapped potential for local business development.

Photo: Stsiapan Stureika

Conservation and further development of historical sites in partnership with local institutions can become a driving force for the development of small towns and rural areas. To make it happen, adequate planning has to be done from both architectural and social perspectives. Here are my main recommendations to the responsible authorities on national and local levels:

1. In the field of regional planning:

- To introduce the concept of “cultural landscape” into normative acts on territorial planning, and to use it together with “buffer zone” of monuments.
- To stimulate the creation of so-called “castle clusters” from most closely situated castles (sometimes despite of short distance they are situated in different administrative areas like Mir and Niasviž) with the aim of tourism development and strengthening of social, cultural and economical ties between settlements.

- To focus on the development of tourist offers for 24-hour or night-stays. The absolute majority of present-day visits are short excursions, not contributing to local economic and social development. Besides all this could lead to diversification and strengthening of local business communities (Fig. 3).

2. In the field of community development and social capacity-building:

- To take into consideration and to adopt statements of the most modern international documents like the Valetta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas (Valetta, 2011) and the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro, 2005).
- Local stakeholders have to be considered as primal users of renovated objects. That’s why exactly their priorities should be taken into consideration when choosing prospective functions of castle objects (especially in case of state-sponsored conservation).
- To promote principles and best practices of openness, transparency and civic participation in the course of administrative planning. All local stakeholders need to have access to the information on the sequence and the type of activities related to the reconstruction of specific objects, etc. Consultations, round tables and involvement of professional associations and local communities should become an obligatory component of the process. Corresponding social researches should be done on obligatory basis.

References

- Actions of State Program “Castles of Belarus”, 2011. Appendix 1. Available from: <<http://www.government.by/upload/docs/file2a077db17a6a598f.PDF>>. [07 June 2015].
- Edson G. 2004. Heritage: Pride or Passion, Product or Service? *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 333–348.
- Hodges A., Watson S. 2000: Community-based Heritage Management: A Case Study and Agenda for Research. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 231-243.
- Holmes K. 2003: Volunteers in the Heritage Sector: A Neglected Audience. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 341-355.
- Hung K. et al. 2011: Testing the Efficacy of an Integrative Model for Community Participation. *Journal of Travel Research*, vol. 50, no. 3., pp. 276-288.
- Pendlebury J. et al. 2004: The Conservation of English Cultural Built Heritage: A Force for Social Inclusion? *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 11–31.
- World Heritage Centre, Periodic Report - Section II - Mir Castle Complex, 2014. Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/periodicreporting/EUR/cycle02/section2/groupb/625.pdf>>. [07 June 2015].
- World Heritage Centre. Periodic Report - Section II - Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh, 2014. Available from: <<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/periodicreporting/EUR/cycle02/section2/groupb/1196.pdf>>. [07 June 2015].
- Стурейко С. et al., 2014 Отчет по исследованию “Восстановление замков как культурный и социальный проект”. Минск: Евробеларусь. Available from: <http://methodology.by/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/2014_Vosstanovleniye-zamkov.pdf>. [07 June 2015].



Sites

Moderator: Prof. Michael Turner
(Bezalel Academy, Jerusalem)

Civil Society vs. the City of Berlin: Saving the Historic Gas Lanterns of Berlin

Michael Strecker, "Denk mal an Berlin" and "DenkmalWacht Brandenburg-Berlin"¹

The City of Berlin possesses about half of the ca. 80,000 existing gas-powered street lamps in the world. This alone makes Berlin the "gas-light capital of the world". Not only individual streets or squares are illuminated by these "shining beauties" but also



Fig. 1: Model Lamp, also called "Schinkel Lantern", used from 1892 to the 1950s.

Photo: Bertold Kujath

whole city districts and quarters in inner and outer city areas. Their introduction (1826) and first designs are associated with the famous architect Karl Friedrich Schinkel and his ministerial colleague Christian Peter Wilhelm Beuth (Fig. 1). Since they used British technological know-how, the lamps are not only a Berlin/Prussian/German but also a British heritage. Gas light had been installed on a significant scale first in London in 1807 (Pall Mall) with a major revolutionary impact on society and involving the development of a sophisticated technological system and infrastructure (Tomory 2012).

The Senate of Berlin - the town's government - however, in their Lighting Strategy of 2011, decided to replace practically all the existing gas-powered lamps (then ca. 44,000) with electric light. Various NGOs have come together to fight for the preservation of this important heritage and formed an alliance "Gas Light is Berlin". Members of this alliance are "Denk mal an Berlin e. V.", "DenkmalWacht Brandenburg-Berlin e. V." and "yes2gaslicht.berlin" as well as Baukammer Berlin - Ausschuss Denkmalschutz und -pflege; Deutsche Stiftung Denkmalschutz - Kuratorium Berlin; Gaslicht-KulturInformation. Information on the campaign, activities and the organizations can be found on www.gaslicht-ist-berlin.de (in German and English).

By their survival alone, their sheer number, outstanding design etc., Berlin's gas-powered street lamps are a potential technological and cultural World Heritage, both tangible and intangible (Fig. 2). Two leading experts on cultural heritage, Dr. Dietrich Worbs and Dr. Peter Burman, have compiled reports (available online on the website above) justifying the status of Berlin Gas Street Light and Lamps as a monument and a World Heritage.

The report by Peter Burman clearly shows that Berlin's Gas Street Lights and Lamps are of Outstanding Universal Value and fulfill the criteria for inscription as a World Heritage: by their impact on history they exhibit "an important interchange of human values" (criterion ii of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention), and represent an "outstanding example of a ... technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates a significant stage(s) in human history" (criterion iv).



Fig. 2: Gas lamps are part of Berlin's cultural history and visual identity, as illustrated by this sketch ("The Constable") of Berlin's most famous drawer Heinrich Zille.

Copyright: Heinrich Zille Museum

The gas lamps' outstanding quality of design and workmanship by famous architects and designers, their place in the surrounding ensembles, in particular as an important and unrecognized part



Fig. 3: Berlin's most famous gas lamp is the one from the world-famous anti-war song, "Lili Marleen" which inspired this painting by Matthias Koeppel, "The Lantern in front of the Big Gate", oil on canvas, 60 x 80 cm, 2015.

Photo: Sooki Koeppel

¹ „Think about Berlin“ and „MonumentsWatch Berlin-Brandenburg“

of the industrial and technical heritage, as a fully functional lighting system and infrastructure, but also for their intangible value (flair, image, atmosphere, identity, occurrence in literature, poetry,

song and music, portrayed in art, still inspiring artists today, their benevolent light preserving and not killing insects (which electric lamps do) (Fig. 3).

A case for a stronger position of civil society in World Cultural Heritage

Hellmut von Laer, "Denk mal an Berlin" and "yes2gaslicht.berlin"²

We just have heard it: The gaslight and Berlin's gas streetlights are a potential world cultural heritage. This is not entirely new: the World Monuments Fund in New York has already put gaslight and Berlin's gas streetlights on its 2014 Watch List. So the public throughout the world has long known: Cultural world heritage is threatened here. And anyone who has asked the question during this time, "From demise or destruction?", then learned: the government of a German state – the Senate of Berlin – has decided that the complete ensemble of 44,000 gas streetlights is to be destroyed. And the Senate began immediately to carry out the destruction: 7,750 gaslights have already been extinguished and replaced by the unpleasant, bright light of outdated electric lamps (not LED). These 7,750 historic gas streetlights have been cut up and scrapped so far by the Berlin State Government.

This leads me to address the role of civil society and the gaslight in Berlin, which is today's topic. I would first like to share with you some words from German State President Joachim Gauck: "The colourful character of our world also includes the colours of night and its illumination". Then Gauck firmly and clearly demanded the preservation of the gaslight for Berlin and other German cities. And within this context, Gauck said the following about civil society: "Not those who always cling to the past are at work here but highly open-minded citizens who are concerned with preserving things that are beautiful and worth keeping". We should be thankful to the German president for these words. But I think in our case: the task of civil society demands – as you will soon see – far more than open-minded citizens.

But this is absolutely correct: The cosy evening light of the gas streetlights is characteristic of Berlin. It stands for Berlin's flair, creates a sense of identity and feelings of security, and symbolises individuality in the urban space. (Fig. 4)

But there is even more to this: If the public space is an important



Fig. 4: Hanging Lamp, used for main streets from 1900 to the 1950s.

Photo: Bertold Kujath

component of our life, then it also belongs to our private sphere. Then we are not only responsible for our house and garden. Then we should focus our attention on the fountain, the cherub and the square, the street, the tree and the streetlight. Berlin has as many cultural scenes as hardly any other metropolis. With all of the street cafes and art initiatives, with the municipal theatre, with authentic pubs and urban gardeners: should we – the citizens, the critical civil society – allow our evening light to be taken away from us and out of our private sphere in front of our door? In terms of urban planning and architecture, Berlin's aesthetically unique gaslight can be a standard for the quality of life anywhere in the world.

Beyond the gaslight and Berlin, the next point relates to the role of light in our age. We can state: The electrical illumination of the cities has led to a considerable brightening of the night during recent years. Some places have become so bright that starlight is no longer visible. The United Nations have proclaimed the year 2015 as the "International Year of Light", and we welcome this. For it invites a public dialogue with the participation of the state, regarding the question: To what extent does light research and technology influence human culture and nature? And within this dialogue, the gaslight will be a standard for good light quality – good as it respects nature. (Fig. 5)

You might have asked yourself during the past five minutes: What are the actual reasons for removing this light and these lamps in Berlin? I have also asked myself the same for more than three years. The Senate of Berlin says: "We are doing this for climate protection". But the share of gas illumination in Berlin's entire CO₂ output is just 0,17 %. However, the Senate of Berlin also says: "We must take this action for financial reasons". But to this day, we –



Fig. 5: Cap Lamp, the most widespread gas lamp in Berlin, introduced in the 1920s.

Photo: Bertold Kujath

² „Think about Berlin" and „yes2gaslight.berlin"

the citizens and the critical civil society – have not been informed about the budget figures for the whole action. We have publically requested them more than once. And what about the Senate's official figures on the replacement of the 7,750 streetlamps for the period since 2012?

Ladies and gentlemen, dear friends: These figures cannot be used to justify the replacement of the gaslights. This attempt by the Senate has failed: the calculation shows major deficiencies. It is contradictory and highly misleading. Its evaluation by an independent auditor shows: It contains a serious, questionable discrepancy. Despite their right of control, Berlin's Audit Office or the Parliament have not come to their own conclusion on this. We - the citizens and critical civil society – declare: A world cultural heritage is being wilfully destroyed here without any substantive reason. (Fig. 6)



Fig. 6: Serial Lamp for main streets, introduced in the 1950s.

Photo: Bertold Kujath

The following statement also fits this scenario when we read: The 7,750 electrical lamps that have just been installed are "meanwhile outdated". This statement follows hot on the heels of the Senate's proud announcement that the best of technology has supplanted gas light. And lastly we read: The purchase of such outdated electrical lamps, for presumably 35 million Euros, occurred "due to a formal error in the tender". Oh, yes. This is how it is. But this sad saga will soon come to an end.

What does all of this mean for gaslight and gas streetlights in Berlin and for their protection as a world heritage? Within the UN, the UNESCO is a specialized agency of nearly 200 member states. According to Art. 13, Paragraph 1 of UNESCO's World Heritage Convention of 1972, only a member state has the right to request international support for protection from the World Heritage Committee. For Germany, this means: The state government within the territory where the cultural heritage is located, must first request the protection. Only then can the Conference of German Cultural Ministers make the official request for Germany to the World Heritage Committee. For our case, this means: Without the positive vote of the Berlin Senate – which previously decided on and carried out the demolition – the right to make a request according to Article 13 of the Convention will not be exercised by Germany. I assume you will agree with me: this situation is not acceptable for critical citizens and civil society. And I assume: such a situation was not in the minds of the Convention's fathers 43 years ago.

Notwithstanding Article 13, apparently a discussion is now taking place about establishing a separate right for civil society groups to request the protection of natural and cultural heritage from the World Heritage Committee. But dear friends, such right would basically be a problem even in the UNESCO member states that

have free and democratic constitutional rules, since in such countries the formation of political will essentially occurs within the parties and parliaments, and NGOs are generally not excluded from the formation of political will.

But what if a situation exists as in Berlin: the state – which is responsible for the protection of cultural heritage - is both pursuing its destruction and avoiding a dialogue with civil society groups. In this case, it should now be reasonable to work together with you in directly asking the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO for help. I am convinced that the World Heritage Centre will then ask the Berlin Senate to rethink its position. A corresponding approach could be applied to similar cases elsewhere. In this sense, I am looking forward to having a good discussion with you. Dear friends, we hold a major historical legacy in our hands. Look at Berlin! Look at this city! We need your help.



Fig. 7: Satellite image of Berlin. The different types of light coincide with the former border between East and West Berlin.

Photo: Chris Hadfield / NASA

A brief final word: We all know that for 25 years, the division of Berlin into an eastern Soviet sector and the sectors of the Western Allies has been overcome. But if you now look at the city lights on a satellite photograph, you will still recognize the division of the city: On the eastern side, which is almost entirely lit brightly by electric street lamps, there is a lot of light smog and much power consumption and much CO₂ emission. And on the west side there is the dimmed light radiation effect of gas lanterns (Fig. 7). Why do I say that? The Senate of Berlin should finally take a principal decision to convert the electric street lighting in the city to LED lighting in order to contribute to a significant reduction of light smog and in particular of CO₂ in Germany. Such a principle decision would be far-sighted and forward-looking in the context of the G7 summit in Elmau.

References

Tomory, L. 2012: Progressive Enlightenment – The Origins of the Gaslight Industry, 1780-1820. Cambridge: MIT Press

Again and Again “Trouble in Paradise”? The Berlin-Potsdam Cultural Landscape

Saskia Hüneke, Arbeitsgruppe für Umweltschutz und Stadtgestaltung Potsdam (ARGUS)¹



Fig. 1: View from Babelsberg Park over the Marble Palace to Pfingstberg Belvedere, and partly greened historical residential areas in between.

Photo: wikimedia commons

The Berlin-Potsdam cultural landscape found on the southwestern outskirts of the German capital has been evolving since about 1660, meaning it has been developing over 350 years into a top-class work of landscape art and architecture. The city of Potsdam, today's capital of the federal state of Brandenburg, is embedded in this artfully designed landscape. Its location in the lowlands of the Havel river results in the visibility of buildings and landscapes far beyond the city. Therefore, the visual integrity and the protection of the environment surrounding the World Heritage property play a special role (Fig. 1).

During the 40 years of socialist rule, much of the site has fallen into disrepair, but despite some high-rise buildings, the original landscape views, by and large, can still be experienced. The former royal parks were professionally maintained during that time.

Experience from the first decade after 1990

After the peaceful revolution in East Germany in 1989 and German unification in 1990, a new legal framework came into effect. New opportunities for conservation and restoration stood against the danger of damage caused by insensitive new buildings. The wise

foresight of inscription of large parts of the cultural landscape on the UNESCO World Heritage List occurred already in 1990, with expansions following in 1992 and 1999.

With more than 3,600 individual monuments, the restoration of the historic fabric of the city had a positive factor; the results not only drew more tax incentives, but also a strong urban heritage conservation staff which was part of the city's cultural department until 2000. The "Stiftung Preußische Schlösser und Gärten" (Foundation Prussian Palaces and Gardens, known as SPSG) managed to extend and continue the restoration works. In addition, lively civil engagement, organized in the form of associations and initiatives, sprung up and mobilized additional financial commitments from big patrons. The best cases in point was the salvaging of the Belvedere on the Pfingstberg, with its panoramic view of the whole world heritage landscape, and the political decision to reconstruct the city palace with its historic façade for the new parliament building in the center of Potsdam.

Nonetheless, there were problems with new buildings, although the internationally established World Heritage protection was enshrined in 1996 as a monument area, which created guidelines on the level of municipal statute law². With the lack of experience

¹ ARGUS Potsdam e.V.: since 1998, the organization's "Working Group for Urban Development and Environmental Protection" has been working for sustainable urban development in Potsdam.

² <https://www.potsdam.de/content/satzung-zum-schutz-des-denkmalbereichs-berlin-potsdamer-kulturlandschaft-gemaess-eintragung>

in local self-governance in East Germany coupled with funding and tax incentives for experienced real estate developers, there were frequently cases of “quantity instead of quality”, i.e. size rather than quality.

The most spectacular example was the dispute between 1993 and 1996 over the Potsdam Center, a shopping mall with 190,000 m² of gross floor area, as well as the construction of the main train station in the midst of the urban landscape (Fig. 2 and 3). In



Fig. 2: Havel landscape between the Potsdam Center and the historical city center.
Photo: Hüneke 2015

addition to the monument conservation authorities, many citizens struggled against this project. In 1996, ARGUS Potsdam founded the “Action Community for a City-Compatible Potsdam Center” (AGPC) with great support among the population. There were hundreds of votes against the development plan³ in the public participation procedure, including letters to the Federal Government, the German Commission for UNESCO, and the UNESCO World Heritage Center in Paris, as well as nationwide press coverage. The German Council for Land Care and the prestigious Pückler Society also became involved.⁴ The main point of this protest was that the Potsdam Center was expected to go beyond the sense of scale in the landscape and would give the wrong signals for further urban development. However, the Center was built, and the prediction has come true.

At that time we were disappointed by UNESCO, as we had hoped that a categorical rejection of the plans would lead to a compre-

3 Potsdam, Bebauungsplan (“Development plan”) No. 37, now divided and amended several times. A “development plan” under Federal German building law is the legal basis for larger construction projects decided by the local council after a public participation process, i.e. the decision of the extent of the Federal Government’s adherence to its commitment under the World Heritage Convention is ultimately taken on the municipal level.

4 Deutscher Rat für Landespflege: Pflege und Entwicklung der Potsdamer Kulturlandschaft, Heft 66, 1995. (German Council for Land Care: Maintenance and Development of the Cultural Landscape of Potsdam, Issue no. 66, 1995)

hensive new plan. Our demand for an urban design competition was only granted for a subsection of the project in 1996, and Potsdam was not inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger. Thus, a political decision for a new start of the planning became impossible. The only positive result was the further withdrawal of



Fig. 3: Potsdam Center with Potsdam main train station, 2004.

Photo: www.deutschebahn.com

the Center from the riverbank, but the total volume of the building blocks remained the same. In the future, after the last building is constructed, you will enter the center of Potsdam through a gorge of building blocks several hundred meters long, rather than experiencing the city’s location on the river.⁵

First reactions

After the realization following the building of the Center’s first construction blocks, our criticism was even better understood, i.e. the growing public awareness of the special nature of the World Heritage landscape. This had grave political consequences; in 1998, the directly-elected Lord Mayor and the City Councillor for Construction were voted out. The municipal election in 1998 strengthened the critics and thus the concern of the World Heritage protection in the city council.

Also, on the level of UNESCO bodies, lessons have been drawn from Potsdam and from challenging cases elsewhere. Consequently, the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, which govern the Periodic Reporting and the Preventive Monitoring by ICOMOS experts, have been adopted and, where appropriate, further developed.

5 City council of the City of Potsdam, Final Report of the Temporary Committee Potsdam Center, DS 00/0793.

However, new concrete problems come up again and again, prompting ARGUS to submit critical supplements of the reports of Brandenburg in 1998 and 2008, and felt it necessary to conduct a conference “World Heritage and Civic Engagement” in 2008 in order to strengthen public awareness.⁶ After the city council had adopted a decision for a “Framework Plan for the Urban Development of the Areas Surrounding the World Heritage Site of Potsdam” in 2005, the Green Alliance caucus in the city council initiated a “Fundamental Decision to Protect the World Heritage” in 2006, which ordered the mayor to establish an administrative procedure for the early detection of undesirable developments and for the coordination of the authorities in charge.⁷ The Declaration of the Buffer Zone and a related administrative agreement were

only signed by the appropriate authorities on 26 January 2011. It defines the necessary distance away from the World Heritage Site and which special assessments must be made for new constructions concerning long-distance visual effect⁸ (Fig. 4).

The development of the Monuments Statute, the Administrative Agreement and the Buffer Zone resulted in an effective structure. The coordination between the SPSPG, the monument authorities of the city and the State of Brandenburg, as well as the city authorities and investors, have led to good results in several cases; for example, the construction of residential complexes and university buildings in the environment of Sanssouci Park was more appropriate.

The Municipality is making efforts in marketing, too. It has been holding a World Heritage Day every year since 2007, and in 2012 it

6 ARGUS Potsdam e.V.: Welterbe und Bürgerbeteiligung (World Heritage and Civic Engagement), Potsdam 2008 in: http://www.argus-potsdam.de/downloads/Welterbe_Kurzfassung_2009_02_26.pdf

7 Leitplanung für die städtebauliche Entwicklung der Umgebungsbereiche der Welterbestätte Potsdam zum Schutz des Weltkulturerbes, DS 05/SVV/0439, 18.8.2005, sowie Verfahren zu Vorhaben der Stadtentwicklung, DS 06/SVV/0051, Beschluss vom 25.1.2006. (Framework Planning for the Urban Development of the Surrounding Regions of the Potsdam World Heritage Property to Protect the World Cultural Heritage, DS 05 / SIA / 0439, 18.8.2005, and Procedures for Projects of Urban Development, DS 06 / SIA / 0051, Decision of 25.1.2006.)

8 Declaration on the Buffer Zone of the World Heritage Property “Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin” on the Territory of the City of Potsdam, and the Administrative Arrangement of 26.1.2011. Compare <https://www.potsdam.de/content/046-vereinbarung-zur-pufferzone-fuer-das-unesco-welterbe-unterzeichnet> compared to the total area of the World Heritage Property (1,343 ha on the territory of Potsdam), the fixed buffer zone covers an area of 5,294 hectares, including 984 hectares in the inner buffer zone




Fig. 4: City map showing the Core Zone and Buffer Zones I and II of the UNESCO World Heritage Property as of 2011.

Photo: https://www.potsdam.de/sites/default/files/documents/Anlage%201%20Karte_Pufferzone.pdf

organized a centralised World Heritage Day event in Germany. The annual urban campaign in 2014 was called “Life in the UNESCO World Heritage”, which served to further sensitize the general public.

New undesirable developments

Unfortunately, however, there are more negative examples. One of the most questionable projects of the 1990s, the “Potsdam Window” in the middle of the last visual fan between Babelsberg Park and the Potsdam city center, was shelved, but was revived in 2014 on a smaller scale. The mandatory administrative procedure was bypassed and a first decision of the local council ignored the protection of the surroundings.

There are more examples of neglect of the rules; the maintenance of the Glienicke Landscape Park in the Berlin part of the World Heritage property is not guaranteed, the transfer of the park to the SPSG has failed for financial reasons, and the local administration of Berlin’s Zehlendorf district is overwhelmed by the task of steering this process.⁹

In addition, several applications for constructions within the buffer zone have been submitted which are controversial, and as such must be decided by the Minister of Culture of the Land Brandenburg. This is an indication that the mechanisms for preventative efforts towards compromise even now have not taken hold everywhere.

The causes

Again and again the lack of will for cooperation between the municipality, the State of Brandenburg and the SPSG prevails - especially on the part of the municipality since the city’s growth creates a need for space for housing, sports and health. These are important public policy concerns, and they create a competition for space with those of safeguarding the historic cultural landscape. For that reason, public opinion is divided and, accordingly, that of politics and administration. They utilize the beauty of the city but refuse to make compromises for it, not paying enough respect to the World Heritage designation. The public confrontations lead to the impression that everything would be subordinated to the World Heritage status; on the contrary, precisely this is often put aside when different concerns are weighed against each other.

A second major cause is that civic engagement takes place only now and then, and does not have enough public presence. For a central voice, certain capacities are still lacking. The multiplicity of the monument preservation institutions of the state, UNESCO and ICOMOS make it more difficult to take action.

What do we need?

On the federal government level:

- A legally clear and binding adoption of the international commitment to World Heritage protection into German law, and
- to strengthen federal funding, in particular, to protect the green spaces of cultural landscapes (continue stimulus packages).

On the level of federal states:

- Strengthening of the authority of the state monument preservation agencies, keeping them under the cultural departments, as well as the rejection of the transfer of some of their functions to the county governments, as envisaged in Brandenburg.

On the municipality level:

- The Lower Monument Preservation Authorities must be disconnected from the construction authorities in order to have more parity in the balance of public interests,
- to create an interface within the urban planning authorities for the pooling and central management of UNESCO concerns, and
- independent network of citizen initiatives.

On the UNESCO level:

- Improving strategic cooperation of the various institutions, a stronger presence in the municipalities, and cooperation with independent, dedicated local experts,
- publication of the opportunities and powers of the various bodies, such as the advice to the World Heritage managing authorities by ICOMOS,
- promotion of public relations that really reaches the people on the ground, and
- strengthening NGOs, namely, the establishment of a single access point for committed citizens at the federal level. It should be able to inform citizens about the responsibilities of different authorities and to assist them in conveying information, raising public awareness on the different problems, and creating networks. A combination of such an access point with the “Competence Center on World Heritage” required by the German Association of Cities is conceivable.

Under the impression of the moving portrayals of Bhaktapur and Aleppo, I would like to add one thing: Measured against the existential problems and challenges that exist at other World Heritage sites, the general public in Germany has a special obligation to overcome the much smaller difficulties in complying with the World Heritage Convention at “their” sites.

⁹ Karin Berning, Anett Kirchner: Parkanlage Glienicke (Glienicke Park Grounds), in: Tagesspiegel, 6 March 2014

Archeological Sites, Local Populations and Power Structures in Butrint, Albania

Dana Phelps, Stanford University

I believe that before we can tackle the issue of what local communities can do for world heritage, we must first address what world heritage can do for local communities. We need to place the local community at the forefront of heritage projects since they are likely to have the greatest impact on the heritage. While sustainability is ultimately the desired outcome of many heritage-for-development projects, it seems as though these projects are rarely successful. Most of these projects do not take into account the realities and local enmeshments of social institutions, power relations, and sociopolitical structures at play on the ground, often yielding a universalist implementation of heritage-for-development projects.

We see this happening in many of the failed heritage tourism projects in Southeast Asia that devastate connected communities (Winter 2007, 2010), in the indigenous heritage protection projects that do not give full agency to the indigenous peoples (Herrera 2014), and in the community archaeology projects that do not fully understand and engage its local community and thus assume that the project has no effect on the people (Gould and Burtenshaw 2014).



Fig. 1: Butrint ruins and national park in the foreground, and the villages of Shëndëlli (left) and Vrinë (right) in the back. The protected wetland areas extend right to the villages.
Photo: Stephan Doempke

Sustainable heritage and community archaeology projects are growing, albeit rather unsuccessfully (Silverman 2011). Thus, I question how prepared we are to consider the local in these projects. Do we understand who the local really are, their needs and their perceptions of their heritage? Do we understand the complexities of heritage-for-development projects? I believe we need to pull the reins on these projects, take a step back, and give them the anthropological critique that they need. We ought to do this



Fig. 2: Location of Butrint National Park in the south of Albania.
Map: Butrint Foundation

now before these seemingly harmless community archaeology and heritage-for-development practices have lasting damaging effects on the local, and in turn on the site.

Between 2010 and 2013, for several months, I lived among the communities of Butrint, a UNESCO World Heritage site in southern Albania, near the Greek border. Butrint was a Greek city, a Roman colony, and a site of contestation between the Ottomans and the Angevins (Hodges 2006). As a result of millennia of occupation by varying powers, Butrint has resulted in a mosaic of monuments and structures from different ages, such as the Roman theater and Ottoman-period castles (Fig. 1). Today Butrint is situated in the greater Butrint National Park (Fig. 2), which is home to an impoverished fishing and farming community. Poverty levels here are the worst in the country, with an average family income of roughly \$200 a month (ASPBM 2010).

After Butrint was established as a national park in 2000, community development was recognized for its potential to support the sustainable management of the site. The introduction of the heritage-for-development projects was a huge turning point for the site (Butrint Foundation 2006). Major projects set up by site management and international NGOs include an on-site community shop where locals can sell handmade products; environmental

awareness activities; and training programs with the aim to hire workmen for excavations and conservation efforts, to name a few.

When I first went to Butrint in 2010, I was conducting research for my MA thesis, which was intended to understand the complexities of heritage-based community development work at Butrint, identify any underlying problems, and grasp the community's investment in the site. Site management and NGOs initiating the projects were frustrated that they were not yielding the desired outcome of site and community sustainability. They believed the community was the issue and that they cared very little for the archaeological site. Eager to understand what really was the issue with these projects, I spent the next few years conducting an ethnography of the local community to fully fathom the dynamic between the community and the site.

I found several problems with the design and implementation of these projects. Perhaps the greatest problem is that they did not recognize the multiple identities of the connected community. Within Butrint, there are numerous minority groups and diverse villages inhabited by people of different ethnicities, religions, and histories. The village of Xarrë is founded by a Greek minority, mostly Orthodox, and a contested minority group, the Çam Albanians, who are mostly Muslim and face heavy discrimination in Greece. The villagers of Shëndëlli are a Catholic minority from the Mirëdita region in the north of Albania that fled to Butrint at the fall of communism to escape the blood feuds and rule of the Kanun from the Albanian Alps near the Kosovo border. Mursia is largely inhabited by an Aromanian population, a Latin minority native to the southern Balkans. Each village and its diverse ethnic groups share different opinions about Butrint, its role in their lives, and their needs and desires from the site.

However, the projects were tailored to a homogenous local, and thus were unable to respond to distinctive conflicts, identities, and needs. The marginalization of many community groups also became apparent through my ethnography. While some projects made a strong attempt to include women in its various activities, including the running of the handicraft workshop, the villages of the commune of Aliko were not included in these projects even though they are members of Butrint National Park. Through interviews with the mayors of these other villages, I discovered that these villages have long been segregated from park activities. The villagers are aware of this separatism and have developed resentment towards the site.

Beyond social marginalization, I found that the projects were reinforcing the economic inequalities of the villages. Xarrë, for example, profits more than the other villages do since, due to their Greek descent, many villagers move to Greece to make money, and then send the money back to their families in Xarrë as remittances. Shëndëlli and Vrinë are both very poor villages, and rely on the fishing and farming industries for their welfare. Socially, Shëndëlli and Vrinë are not well integrated into the park, since they recently migrated into the region in the late 1990s. My ethnog-

raphy revealed that villagers of Shëndëlli in particular were victim to discrimination within the community. Aware of Shëndëlli's low socio-economic status within the communities, the projects sought to support Shëndëlli by focusing their support on this one village. Interviews with villagers of Shëndëlli showed that many of these people were making a profit from the site.

This was not the case for the other villages. Many of the villagers of Vrinë expressed anger that they were not seeing a profit, observing that only a select group of people were profiting economically, and that these people came from Shëndëlli. One villager from Vrinë asked me in an interview, "What good has Butrint ever done for me? All I see are some families making money from Butrint. But no one cares about us in Vrinë." Many villagers of Vrinë refused to speak with me, angry that their voices were not being heard by site management. My interviews with site management showed an awareness of the selectivity in those that were profiting, but that the anger that had been cultivated had gone unnoticed. While inadvertent, the projects had ignited conflict through favoritism of Shëndëlli. For a group that already faced discrimination in the community, this favoritism would be to the detriment of Shëndëlli, which was becoming further isolated in the community.



Fig 3.

Photo: Dana Phelps

Although site management insisted that the community did not care for the site, my ethnography told a different story. Through my daily interactions with the community over the years, I saw the profound social value that Butrint holds for the community. Butrint lies at the heart of the various identities of this socially fractured community. Everyone who lives in Butrint's vicinity had a story to share with me. These stories were typically of recent traumatic pasts, such as the Çam genocide, communism, or blood feuds. In all of these stories, however, the villagers cited Butrint as a source of hope, freedom, and community. A man and his wife told me of the blood feuds in the north and their escape to Butrint to protect their family from violence. Another man, unveiling his replication of the Butrint baptistery mosaic that took him two years to complete (Fig. 3), explained to me the religious persecutions that affected his family under communism and the importance of protecting the religious tolerance within the community of Butrint. This man told stories of the ethnic tensions between the Albanian Çams and the Greeks, recounting the gen-

ocide and the racial discrimination that has continued into the present. He said his village protects Butrint as Albanian, and that they reinforce their pride for the site through graffiti depicting Butrint. This father sitting outside the bakery with his son in Muris urged me to remember the name of his son that was killed by the communist regime (Fig. 4). He reinforced that Butrint is the place where all villages meet, and that all the villagers are part of the larger community of Butrint. This woman in Xarrë told me the sad and painful stories of her life under communism, and then



Fig. 4

Photo: Dana Phelps

explained that Butrint is home to her and to her community (Fig. 5). Butrint is more than just a site around which a group of people situates its residences. It is a site where diverse peoples of various traumatic histories choose to live and construct or imagine a home in a new landscape. The displaced peoples of the north of Albania now living in Shëndëlli sought out Butrint since its history provided familiarity to them, even though they had never visited the south of Albania. From this perspective, I see Butrint as a site of healing upon which this community constructs its identity. As Serguei Oushakine (2009, p.4) describes in his own fieldwork in post-soviet Russia, "loss was their beginning, their driving force, and their destination," and thus "communities had to be created, new systems of value had to emerge, and traditions of discursive interactions and social exchanges had to be invented."

As the people of Butrint are joined together through diverse losses, a community had to be constructed which fulfilled this void of communal loss. Butrint offers a sense of place upon which these people can construct this community and collective identity. The community of Butrint is bound together by different traumatic pasts, and



they find comfort and stability in the sense of place that is Butrint. This identity based on trauma, and yet also on Butrint, is highly sensitive. We need to be aware of whether or not we are working with vulnerable populations, especially when that vulnerability is not obvious. Project designs that are unsympa-

Fig. 5

Photo: Dana Phelps

thetic towards vulnerability could result in increased traumatization for the individual or collective population, thereby unnecessarily provoking dormant traumas and socio-cultural tensions.

Heritage repurposed towards development is more than just vacant policies and shallow practices. It can have real and powerful effects on the local. Too many heritage practitioners see the local as a burden to their work, believing that engaging the local is unlikely to have a genuine, positive effect on the heritage. Thus, when the heritage-for-development projects fail, as they often do, it is assumed that the projects are a waste of time or that the community is to blame. We must first acknowledge that the connected community is as complex and unique as the site at hand is. These projects require an anthropological approach to deeply understand the people that are likely to be affected by these policies and practices. It would be unethical to do otherwise as these people should not be at the will of poorly fashioned and sloppily delivered projects.

Having taken a Western approach to mobilizing local communities while lacking the deep knowledge of the very people that were likely to be affected by these policies and practices uncovered a recipe for calamity at Butrint. No one had conducted an ethnography of the connected community of Butrint and therefore no one really understood the people that were affected by these projects. Moreover, no one took the time to understand the meaning of Butrint in the community's lives. While the managers and archaeologists of Butrint were insistent that the community of Butrint does not care about the site, my anthropological investigation demonstrated otherwise. This care for the heritage needs to be recognized and nurtured through thoughtfully designed and implemented projects that fully consider the community, its diverse needs and identities. It is at this point that successful projects that balance the needs and values of both the community and the site will emerge.

References

- ASPBM 2010, Integrated Coastal Zone Management and Clean-Up Project: Butrint Management Plan. Available from: <http://www.aspbm.org/uploads/Butrint-MP_final_revised_version_eng_September_2010.pdf>. [30 March 2015].
- Butrint Foundation 2006, The Butrint Foundation Report for 2006. Available from: <<http://www.butrintfoundation.co.uk/Annual%20Reports/ar06.pdf>>. [12 July 2010].
- Gould, PG & Burtenshaw, P 2014, 'Archaeology and economic development', *Public Archaeology*, vol. 13, pp. 3–9.
- Herrera, A 2014, 'Commodifying the indigenous in the name of development: the hybridity of heritage in the twenty-first-century Andes', *Public Archaeology*, vol. 13, pp. 71–84.
- Hodges, Richard 2006, *Eternal Butrint*, General Penne UK, London.
- Oushakine, Serguei 2009, *The Patriotism of Despair. Nation, War, and Loss in Russia*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.
- Silverman, H 2011, 'Archaeologies of Engagement, Representation, and Identity', *Historical Archaeology*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 152–166.
- Winter, Tim 2007, *Post-conflict heritage, postcolonial tourism: tourism, politics and development at Angkor*, Routledge, London & New York.
- Winter, Tim 2010, "Heritage tourism: the dawn of a new era?" in *Routledge Handbook of Heritage in Asia*, eds S Labadi & C Long, Routledge, London, pp. 117–129.

Between Conservation and Transformation: Involving the Local Community of Ivrea, Italy

Nicole De Togni and Francesca Giliberto, Politecnico di Torino¹

The development of the discipline has led to a broader definition of heritage, gradually moving from isolated monuments to entire neighbourhoods and cities: this conceptual change was accompanied by the framing of a series of national and international conventions, charters and recommendations that reflect the contemporary approach to heritage. The *Historic Urban Landscape (HUL)* approach² represents the most recent contribution in the international debate concerning the identification, conservation and enhancement of cultural heritage, opening new scenarios for a landscape-based approach (Veldpaus & Pereira Roders 2013) in urban heritage protection and management.

This approach merges different interpretative levels, and tries to overcome the traditional understanding of preservation strategies, dealing with a stratified heritage gathering different scales and functions. Moving from a mono-disciplinary vision of conservation and urban projects to an integrated and participatory management of change (De Rosa 2014), existing policies and the traditional equilibrium of roles and competences should be rethought (Bandarin & Van Oers 2012), giving a key role – recognised by various international charters, conventions and legal instruments – to the active involvement of local communities.

The Italian town of Ivrea, the city of Adriano Olivetti and his typewriters company, represents an emblematic case where an




Fig. 1: Some examples of Olivetti's modern architecture in Ivrea. The blue color indicates modern architectures and districts, the red the historic ones.

Author: Francesca Giliberto (The base map is the Chart for the Quality of the PRG 2000)

¹ Polytechnical University of Turin.

² The concept was officially determined with the *New Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape* adopted by the UNESCO's General Conference on November 2011.

innovative urban conservation approach is required. The city is the documentation of an alternative scheme of industrial policy implementation, representing “a different model from other industrial cities as it is based on a social and productive system inspired by the community itself”³. Considering its outstanding heritage, “Ivrea, industrial city of the XX century” was included in the Italian Tentative List⁴ of UNESCO in May 2012, with a definition that goes itself beyond the separation between tangible and intangible heritage. Ivrea is a place – geographically and metaphorically – in which “different planning cultures live together, exchange a common idea of modernity, penetrate and build an entire area” (Bonifazio & Giacobelli 2007).

With a legacy of more than 200 buildings shared by over 1200 private and public owners and extending over more than 70% of the entire municipal territory, Ivrea documents a unitary planning experience in a territory of modest dimension (Fig. 1). Especially from 1930 to 1960, it was a real investigation laboratory for architects, who experimented architectural languages, building types, constructive systems and urban planning assets, becoming a true anthology of the “Italian way” to develop modern architecture and urbanism.

The role of Ivrea was undisputed for long but has been declining since the 1990s, ending up in the closure of the factory and the loss of many workplaces: this recession involved a radical change of the town’s socio-economic context that impacted especially the local community. With the crisis of the factory, a new scenario for the development of the city and for the conservation and transmission of Olivetti’s industrial heritage and social experience started to be explored.

During the last two decades, a cultural process was invested in the city that led to the candidacy for the inscription in the World Heritage List. Different cultural activities contributed to the involvement of the local community and the promotion of the UNESCO candidacy. The most relevant were:

- The cultural programme *Officine Culturali ICO* (1996-2001), aiming at transforming the industrial activities into cultural ones;
- The *Catalogue of cultural architectural heritage of Ivrea* (1996-2000);
- The Inauguration of the Open Air Museum of Ivrea Modern Architecture (MaAM) in 2001;
- The establishment of the National Committee for the Celebration of the Centenary of the Olivetti Company⁵ (2008-2010) promoted by the *Fondazione Adriano Olivetti*, the Municipality of Ivrea and the *Politecnico di Milano*. It pro-

moted the discussion on the tools and actions necessary for the enhancement of the industrial heritage (tangible and intangible) and for urban transformations. In 2008 it proposed the candidacy;

- The inscription of “Ivrea, industrial city of the XX century” on the Italian Tentative List in May 2012;
- The preparation of the UNESCO nomination dossier (February 2014 - ongoing), guided by the Municipality of Ivrea, the *Fondazione Adriano Olivetti* and *Fondazione Guelpa*, in collaboration with the Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities, the Piedmont Region and *Città Metropolitana di Torino*;
- The promotion of a traveling exhibit and creation of a specific website, both dedicated to the communication of the UNESCO candidacy process (from December 2014);
- The development of a citizens survey (January-May 2015), investigating local knowledge and perception of the UNESCO candidacy as well as their impressions of the concept “industrial city” related to the history of their town;
- The promotion of an International Seminar “Ivrea, from industrial city to UNESCO site”, involving international experts and local stakeholders, as a moment of discussion on the UNESCO candidacy main issues, on 23-24 March 2015, Ivrea.




Fig. 2: Legislation for the interventions on buildings and their appurtenances, extract from the graphic tables. In red, buildings in category A; in green, category B; in yellow, category C; in blue, category D.

Source: Città di Ivrea 2002, 2013

3 As stated in the *Justification of Outstanding Universal Value* for the inscription in the Italian Tentative List. The document is available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/5736>.

4 More information are available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/5736>.

5 Comitato Nazionale per le Celebrazioni della Società Olivetti.

In this context, special attention has to be paid to *the Catalogue of the Cultural Architectural Heritage of Ivrea*, which is the result of an investigation of modern architecture done between 1996 and 2000 and engendered the *Legislation for the interventions on buildings and their appurtenances*⁶ (Fig. 2). This set of norms aims at maintaining the formal integrity of buildings while allowing interventions for adaptations to standards. To do so, it subdivides the concerned buildings in four categories with precise prescriptions, responding to conservation criteria:

- A: Buildings of monumental significance, on which only actions devoted to the full protection and safeguard are allowed;
- B: Buildings of considerable importance. Interventions to rescue the original composition and formal and chromatic aspects, and to avoid the distortion of the relationship with the surroundings are allowed;
- C: Buildings of minor formal importance, objects of safeguarding of formal aspects;
- D: Minor buildings, subjected to the general regulation without specific prescriptions.

This *Legislation* guides, on one side, the professionals in their technical and formal choices; on the other, it supports the work of the Municipal Offices and in particular the evaluations of the *Observatory of the Open Air Museum of Modern Architecture*⁷, an office created in 2013 to determine and monitor the interventions on the heritage buildings of the Catalogue.

The Legislation and the activity of the *Observatory* however, even if inspired by the purpose of protecting and conserving the heritage, reflect a traditional approach to conservation, in particular in the listing system, that is quite reductive in dealing with such a complex heritage. Their integration with a cultural catalogue could provide the multiple layers of perception of the urban heritage: Citizens, users and owners could actively contribute to the process of definition of the cultural values, which is at the base of any participative policy.

Moreover, from a legislative point of view, the *Nominated Property* is characterised by the co-existence of two regulatory frameworks. The Municipal General Plan (Fig. 3) includes, indeed, not only the norms about buildings provided by the Legislation, but also the norms about urban areas provided by the *Technical Imple-*

*mentation Rules*⁸, highlighting a lack of coordination between legislative instruments.




Fig. 3: Municipal General Plan „PRG 2000”, extract from the graphic table.

Source: Città di Ivrea 2000

As a result, all the buildings of category D but also nine out of ten buildings in category B and some buildings of category A are placed in an urban fabric where restoration, fragmentation, changes in use, enlargements, demolition and rebuilding are allowed. Moreover, the appurtenances of these buildings are subjected only to the *Quality Charter*⁹, a descriptive and not prescriptive document of the Plan defining the right approach to interventions on the historic and modern city but leaving to the Building Code the settlement of the building discipline. A significant responsibility in the heritage's long-term protection and proper management is thus transferred to the local community and in particular to the voluntary commitment and contribution of the owners and inhabitants of the buildings.

6 Città di Ivrea, Normativa per gli interventi sugli edifici e sulle loro pertinenze di cui al Censimento dei beni tipologici e decorativi della città di Ivrea – Catalogo dei beni culturali architettonici, introduced on February 26, 2002 and updated on March 25, 2013.

7 Osservatorio MaAM (Museo a cielo aperto dell'Architettura Moderna).

8 Città di Ivrea, Piano Regolatore Generale 2000 – Norme tecniche di Attuazione.

9 Città di Ivrea, Piano Regolatore Generale 2000 – Carta per la Qualità.

These regulations originated before the UNESCO candidacy and without cross-references. Being at the same level in the legislative hierarchy, planning and authoritative issues can lead to cases of inconsistency, exposing the heritage to pressures deriving from urban development.

The nominated property of Ivrea includes a building stock that is strongly differentiated regarding ownership, functions and architectural solutions, exposed to daily use and to all the related pressure of safety, comfort and functional needs. This case exemplifies the difficulties of the Public Administration in the definition of an adequate legislation and direct instruments of intervention, preservation and maintenance for a heritage that is much more complex than an accumulation of single monuments: The HUL approach could be the right tool to overcome many problems originating in a traditional understanding of the heritage, focusing on a more holistic interpretation of the urban heritage.

Even if different participative activities have been encouraged in the last 15 years, some critical situations still exist: the city is facing a top-down cultural process where local people are involved in some way, but without a specific place in the decision-making process that is made only by the formal institutions promoting the candidacy.

The UNESCO nomination process has certainly helped the quality and frequency of participation and discussion with the local community and stakeholders, but they are not yet enough for guaranteeing an adequate preservation and enhancement of a living industrial legacy. With a more inclusive and participatory strategy, the role of the local community would not be any more the result of the lacks in the legislation transferring to owners and users a significant responsibility in the heritage's long-term protection. Instead, they would be consciously involved in the process of definition of a collectively recognized cultural value, which is at the base of a dynamic, sustainable and fruitful approach to heritage preservation and management. What could be the formal structure of such a participative approach is an important question which remains open to discussion and another challenge to be explored.

Conclusion and recommendations

Considering the peculiar heritage of "Ivrea, industrial city of the XX century", the *Historic Urban Landscape* approach defined by UNESCO's General Conference in 2011 could be the right way to deal with such a complex and dynamic heritage, supporting the transition from the traditional notion of "monument" or "group of buildings" to a more complex concept of urban heritage which is necessary in regards to the industrial city.

- In particular, we recommend taking into consideration the following issues for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and its related guidelines:
- to have a greater recognition of the living dynamics of cities in heritage preservation strategies;
- to promote a bigger involvement of the local community during the preparation of UNESCO nominations, through seminars, focus groups, Parish maps and other participatory tools, on the way to collectively define the complex system of values that has to be preserved over time and to create a common vision both for heritage preservation and city development;
- to better integrate urban conservation with local management and development strategies as well as to facilitate the processes of mediation and negotiation between interests and groups often conflicting, to set priorities and development objectives;
- to promote partnerships and collaboration between private and public stakeholders;
- to help the public administration to define appropriate normative tools and regulatory systems that keep into consideration possible heritage transformations over time, under the guidance of a higher entity aimed at guaranteeing the preservation of heritage values;
- to overcome the distinction between tangible and intangible aspects when referring to the cultural value and to develop suitable tools aimed at managing, monitoring and assessing both tangible and intangible changes over time, on the way to avoid incorrect transformations and maintenance problems as well as to preserve the site Outstanding Universal Value in the long term.

References

- Bandarin, F & Van Oers, R 2012, *The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century*, John Wiley & Sons, Oxford
- Bonifazio, P & Giacomelli, E (eds.) 2007, *Il paesaggio futuro. Letture e norme per il patrimonio dell'architettura moderna a Ivrea*, Umberto Allemandi & Co, Torino
- Città di Ivrea 2000, *Piano Regolatore Generale, Tavola P2.1 and P2.2 Assetto Urbanistico*.
- Città di Ivrea 2002, 2013, *Normativa per gli interventi sugli edifici e sulle loro pertinenze di cui al Censimento dei beni tipologici e decorativi della città di Ivrea – Catalogo dei beni culturali architettonici*, Tables, introduced on February 26, 2002 and updated on March 25, 2013.
- De Rosa, F 2014, 'Valori e valutazioni del paesaggio storico urbano: metodologie ed approcci per la conservazione integrata e gestione dei siti unesco', *Bollettino del centro Calza Bini*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 61-84
- UNESCO 2011, *Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape*, adopted by the UNESCO General Conference on 10 November 2011
- Veldpaus, L & Pereira Roders, A 2013, 'Historic urban landscapes: an assessment framework', Paper presented during the 33rd Annual Conference of the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA13) *Impact assessment: The next generation*, 13-16 May 2013, Calgary, Canada.

Civil Participation in the World Heritage Nomination of Diyarbakır, Turkey

Necati Pirinççioğlu, Diyarbakır Consultative Committee

The city of Diyarbakır is situated in southeastern Turkey which is also a part of North Mesopotamia with its “fertile crescent”. Diyarbakır was founded at the Tigris River on the plateau of the volcanic mountain Karacadağ.

Diyarbakır is at the junction of the routes from and to Middle-South Mesopotamia, Anatolia, and the northern countries, which has given strategic importance to this city throughout history and created a city with many cultures, identities, beliefs and languages. This junction is why all the civilizations, with the intent to dominate the region, have waged wars for the control of Diyarbakır. Before it was known as Diyarbakır, it was called “Amida” from antique periods to the Middle Ages.

Diyarbakır, along with its fortress, is a rare city in the 21st century (Fig. 1). It is a city which symbolizes the extensive urban history accumulated over many periods of time. An important example of its significance is found in the many documents it holds from some of the biggest civilizations in the region and from the earliest periods to date.



Fig. 1: The city walls of Diyarbakır are among the longest in the world. Built of black basalt in the 4th century AD, they stretch almost unbroken for about 6 kilometres around the city.
Photo: Richard Brotherton

Due to its special relation with the Tigris River, Diyarbakır has become one of the most magnificent cities. Visiting this city was a must for all emperors. Furthermore it was the capital of the Artuqids, Merwanids, Aqqoyunlus, an Ottoman capitol of the greater region (beylerbeyi) Diyar-Bekr, and the eastern border

of the Roman Empire as a garrison city. All these empires have emphasized their ruling over this city by producing coins with the symbol of Amida.

The first settlement was around the Amida mound in the 5th millennium BCE; because of its topography it offered a good defense and a large area suitable for the expansion of the city. The first fortress structure was built by the Hurrians in approximately 3000 BCE. The current form of the fortress was constructed in the 4th century by the Romans and has always been an area of continuous settlement.



Fig. 2: Part of the city walls have been adorned with inscriptions in many different scripts and languages, often next to each other, testifying to the cultural diversity which has characterized the town throughout its history.
Photo: Diyarbakır Kalesi ve Hevsel Bahçeleri Kültürel Pejzajı Alan Yönetimi

In their efforts of attacking or defending the city of Diyarbakır, all empires had destructive effects on the fortress. However, after each destruction, the fortress was repaired and renewed immediately as the next attack was expected. During the Roman period these actions were documented with numerous inscriptions which

created a type of “museum of inscriptions” (Fig. 2). Additionally, there are other aspects which make the Fortress of Diyarbakır outstanding. The “aesthetic values” are magnificent considering its function as a fortress, especially compared with others around the world. The reliefs on the towers and gates of different shapes and figures are considered works of art.



Fig. 3: The aerial view of Diyarbakır shows the unbroken city wall and the city's location above the Tigris River Valley with the Hevsel Gardens.

Photo: Diyarbakır Kalesi ve Hevsel Bahçeleri Kültürel Pejzażı Alan Yönetimi

The Hevsel Gardens are included as a part of Diyarbakır according to the historical topography. In historical documents, the gardens are mentioned for the first time in the 9th century BCE. An early mention of the gardens came the king of the Assurians, who wrote about the gardens when he occupied the area saying that he “vainly besieged the fortress, but plundered the gardens outside the city”. The Hevsel gardens served the city with its flowers and crops for thousands of years and, in general, as a unique landscape (Fig. 3).

The establishment of a site management plan

In Fall 2011, long existing discussions about the cultural and natural areas to be conserved started systematically and broadly with the initiation of the Metropolitan Municipality and the active participation of the civil society. These discussions led to the establishment of the Diyarbakır Fortress and Hevsel Gardens Cultural Landscape Site Management, overseen by the Diyarbakır Metropolitan Municipality.

The area of the Diyarbakır Fortress and Hevsel Gardens Cultural Landscape has 2,182 hectare land in total and consists of the following main zones (Fig. 4):

- Heritage area 521 ha
- Urban Buffer Zone (inside+outside of the fortress) 132 ha
- Buffer zone in the Tigris Valley 1,529 ha

The fortress of Diyarbakır was inscribed on the UNESCO tentative list of heritage sites in 2000. The preparation of the Diyarbakır Fortress and Hevsel Gardens Cultural Landscape Site Management Plan began in January 2012. The areas of the site management

have been approved by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism on 7th October 2012. The creation of the “coordination and monitoring commission”, established by the Site Management, approved this plan in February 2014, where it was subsequently submitted to the World Heritage Center (WHC).

During the application process the role of the strong and organized civil society of Diyarbakır was crucial. As a result, the process was developed in a participatory and transparent way, and is considered to be quite successful.

The civil society that participated consisted of a variety of groups: professional organizations (engineers, architects, lawyers, medical doctors, etc.), unions, NGOs (human rights, environmental, women, cultural, etc.), academics, social movements and different institutions. At the beginning of 2012 a broad “advisory board” at the Diyarbakır Fortress and Hevsel Gardens Site Management was established and included individuals with special skills, representatives of peoples councils from related neighbourhoods (a tool of direct democracy has existed already for 7–8 years in many neighbourhoods of the city) and of the Ministry

for Culture and Tourism. The following commissions have been built up within the Advisory Board in order to raise the participation: the Coordination and Monitoring Commission, the Academic Commission, the Education and Information Commission and the Communication Commission.

The sensitivity and efforts of the civil society for the cultural and natural heritage of Diyarbakır dates back many years. In 2003, within the Local Agenda 21 process, the city council was founded and the related activities of the civil society became more organ-




Fig. 4: The city walls and Hevsel Gardens form the core zone of the WH Property; the inhabited old town inside the walls is a buffer zone.

Map: Diyarbakır Kalesi ve Hevsel Bahçeleri Kültürel Pejzażı Alan Yönetimi

ized and visible. The different civil organizations were (and still are) intensively engaged in the conservation of the Diyarbakir Fortress and the Tigris Valley of which the Hevsel Gardens are a part. With the UNESCO WH site process, they have participated and shared their views and experience.

These commissions took part in the projects by analyzing the socio-economic situation of the city. In this framework, 68 NGOs joined a survey in the old city "Surici" (an area inside the fortress) with 400 households where they could establish relations with the heads of the neighbourhoods. Beyond that, nine group meetings were organized about the following subjects: historical site management and tourism, general site management, Hevsel Gardens and Tigris Valley, intangible cultural heritage, social life (education, health, recreation, culture and security), women, children and youth and disabled people. Additionally, two workshops were organized in order to do an analysis about the "strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats"; the results were published as a book.

About the related management site, many scientific works were carried out. They were done voluntarily by members of the advisory board including people from different countries. Works have been done and articles have been published about the inscriptions on the fortress, the survey of the Amida mound, the architecture and structure of the fortress, the antique period of Diyarbakir, the geo-morphological structure, the flora and fauna of the Tigris Valley, environmental problems in Diyarbakir, the agricultural operations in the Hevsel Gardens and water and soil quality. The scientific works about the management site continue and there are efforts to publish their results.

In consequence of these scientific works, several conservation decisions have been taken in the site management plan in order to develop a holistic conservation approach not only for the management area, but also for the whole river basin (the buffer zone).

Decisions made on basin scale

Below is a list of some of the actions taken for the protection of the Tigris Basin based on the scientific research conducted:

- Development of a "Tigris Basin Conservation Plan" for the protection of the ecological equilibrium, natural habitats, biodiversity and the flora-fauna structure, and some examples of how to address environmental risks.
- Conducting of an "environmental impacts assessment" for middle and large scale housing projects according to the regulations of UNESCO, and a "cultural landscape impact assessment" according to the decision of ICOMOS.

- Restoration of the fortress, which must be done in line with the Integrated Wall Restoration Programme.
- Conservation of wetlands in the Tigris Valley which are part of the ecological structure and habitat for migrating birds and Euphrates Soft Shell Turtle (*Rafetus Euphraticus*)
- Development of sub-regions for the conservation of biodiversity.
- Preparation of a rural landscape inventory and prevention of planting exotic trees, plants and landscape implementations.
- Preparation of a flora and fauna inventory for the management site, observing the wildlife and expulsion of risky elements from the site.
- Prohibition of all activities and operations, within the management plan, in the Tigris River basin which decrease the water quality and quantity and negatively change the river channel and its wetlands.
- Respect of the right to house people and the prevention of gentrification when any urban transformation is done in the quarters Suriçi, Ben u Sen and Fiskaya/Feritköşk.



Fig. 5: The Tigris Valley and Hevsel Gardens are protected both as a cultural landscape and an important habitat for rare biodiversity. The Diyarbakir city walls can be seen in the background.

Photo: Diyarbakir Kalesi ve Hevsel Bahçeleri Kültürel Pejzajı Alan Yönetimi

For the conservation of the management site, the Observation and Monitoring Commission is held responsible. This Commission observes all activities in the site as a whole and reports regularly to the site management. In case of any observed contradictory activities, the local authorities or the central government are informed and requested to remove or halt the harmful activity. In this framework several successful cases have been achieved recently, the most important being the cancellation of three hydroelectric power plants in and around the city planned by State Hydraulic Works (DSI). The declaration of the Hevsel Gardens as a "construction reserve area" and the consequent "Tigris Valley Landscape Project" prepared by the Ministry for Environment and Urbanization have been annulled by the administrative court. In line with the latter project, the decision taken by the sub-body of the Ministry for Food, Agriculture and Livestock to abolish the agricultural status of the Hevsel Gardens has been canceled, too.

All these efforts are done as a duty in order to conserve the cultural and natural heritage and transmit it to the next generations.



Cultural Landscapes

Dr. Inge Gotzmann
(Bund Heimat und Umwelt in Deutschland)

The Engagement of Homeland Associations for the World Heritage in Germany

Dr. Inge Gotzmann, Bund Heimat und Umwelt in Deutschland (BHU)¹

Homeland associations in Germany and Europe

At the beginning of the XX century, homeland associations were established in Germany and in other European countries. The reason was the changes and the destruction of landscapes in the course of industrialization, and the rapid growth of cities coming along with it. This situation resulted in a sense of loss which early was reflected in the responsibility and, consequently, in the engagement for the preservation of cultural and natural heritage.

The “Bund Heimat und Umwelt in Deutschland” (BHU) is the national umbrella association of citizen and homeland organizations in Germany. Through its state-level associations, it combines around half a million members and therefore it is the biggest cultural citizens’ movement of its kind in the Federal Republic of Germany. Since its establishment in 1904, it promotes cultural landscapes and the people living in them.¹

Especially, the association stands out for its interdisciplinary approach: it unifies issues concerning the protection of nature and the environment, monument and building cultural traditions as well as intangible cultural heritage (languages, dialects, traditions etc.). This is not only about the preservation of existing values, but also about the active involvement of citizens in the formation of their living environment.

The BHU is also closely connected with other homeland associations in Europe, like Finland, Sweden, the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland and Italy. Furthermore, the BHU actively works as a Member Organization in other European networks like

CIVILSCAPE, the civil society network for landscapes in Europe, and with Europa Nostra, the network for cultural heritage in Europe.

The example of the Upper Middle Rhine Valley World Heritage Site

The BHU Member Association “Rheinischer Verein für Denkmalpflege und Landschaftsschutz” (RVDL) (Rhenish Association for Monument Conservation and Landscape Protection) played a



Fig. 1: The Middle Rhine Valley with the World Heritage area.

Map adapted from Lencer / wikimedia commons

leading role in preparing and structuring the Upper Middle Rhine Valley World Heritage Site. This UNESCO area is located within the territory of the RVDL, which has more than 5,000 members. Therefore, activities of the association have taken place there for a long time, especially those regarding building culture and monument conservation. The early activities of the RVDL include the acquisition of Stahleck Castle (1909) and the ruins of Stahlberg Castle (1914) that since then have been protected and preserved by the association.

¹ Association Homeland and Environment in Germany



Fig. 2: The UNESCO World Heritage Cultural Landscape Upper Middle Rhine Valley is marked by castles and vineyards.

Photo: Stephan Doempke

The Upper Middle Rhine Valley, with 65 km of length along the river Rhine, is located in the federal states of Rhineland-Palatinate and Hessen in western Germany (Fig. 1). In the UNESCO description, this area is portrayed as a cultural landscape of great diversity and beauty. The description also states: "The landscape shows an extraordinary richness in cultural references as well as historical and artistic associations. The particular appearance of the Middle Rhine Valley is due, on the one hand, to the natural shape of the river landscape and on the other hand, to the design induced by men. [...] Over centuries, a landscape emerged testifying to the interaction between man and nature, cultural achievements and their repercussion on the development of the landscape space". (www.unesco.de/kultur/welterbe/welterbe-deutschland/oberes-mittelrheintal.html) (Fig. 2).

The starting point of the civic engagement in the World Heritage area was the Rhine Valley Conference in 1997, a symposium organized by the RVDL which brought together participants from the region, political representatives and experts on cultural landscapes. The great potential of the region in terms of natural and cultural heritage became clear on this occasion.

Likewise, also the risk of this heritage due to recurring construction projects became visible. As a result of the conference, the Rhine Valley Charter was adopted (www.rheinischer-verein.de/media/themen/projekte/weltkulturerbe_mittelrheintal/Rheintal_Charta.pdf), and the nomination for the World Heritage status was targeted and later accompanied.

In 2002 the area was inscribed in the World Heritage List, without a Master Plan for its preservation being presented. With the designation, activities of RVDL in the region increased. These included meetings, guided tours, opinions and the creation of networks with different stakeholders. At the same time, there was and there is need to prevent severe interventions in the World Heritage Site, such as the planning to build a bridge over the Rhine, the structural development of the Lorelei Rock, and the planning of the construction of wind turbines on the ridge of the Rhine Valley. In this context, the "Middle Rhine Valley World Heritage Site Action Alliance" was founded upon initiative of the RVDL together with

other organizations. But also the many activities for the conservation and preservation of building culture as well as the viticultural landscape and continuation of the ferry connection across the Rhine took up key issues of the World Heritage Site.

Together with the RVDL, the BHU and CIVILSCAPE have cooperated in the participation procedures for the Master Plan (Management Plan). The creation of the Master Plan happened with a strong time lag, so unfortunately the momentum and the broad civic commitment from the application phase could not be used, and after more than ten years the civic engagement had to be reawakened.

In the meantime, for many stakeholders in the region it was quite unclear how they could contribute to the preservation of World Heritage Cultural Landscape with their involvement. Offers of a further engagement on the part of CIVILSCAPE with the intention to use its experience from the process of other World Heritage Sites in Germany and Europe, remain unanswered.

Bridge Construction

The Upper Middle Rhine Valley is characterized by a multitude of ferries that connect the two banks of the Rhine. The historical importance of these ferries has been emphasized as a characteristic feature by UNESCO. Nevertheless, there are recurring plans to build a bridge in the area (Fig. 3). This is problematic for the landscape, especially since not only a bridge would be built but also other slip roads and connections to highways. Reference should



Fig. 3: A photo montage of the projected bridge across the Middle Rhine Valley, which is disputed for its many detrimental effects in the integrity of the valley.

Photo / Montage: Roman Schieber

be made to the city of Dresden as a warning example where the construction of a bridge has led to the withdrawal of the World Heritage Status. The RVDL has publicly demanded a compulsory transport assessment to be part of the application of the Middle Rhine Valley for the Federal Garden Show of 2031.

The Middle Rhine Valley Action Alliance has worked intensively on the plans for the bridge, and developed opinions against its construction. In addition, the RVDL prepared a report on the ferries at their own expenses. The report came to the conclusion that the



Fig. 4: Ferry connections have developed historically and are an integral part of the World Heritage. A bridge would weaken these structures. Photo: Stephan Doempke

expansion of the ferry services, the modernization of the ferries and even the free use of the ferries (hitherto fee-based) would be cheaper than the construction of the bridge (Fig. 4). This would improve the situation for all users. Conversely, the further the user's desired Rhine crossing is from the bridge, the less attractive will be the use of the bridge. The bridge would weaken the operation of the ferries and thus reduce their offers.

The plans are an important issue at political level, especially since there are two different factions in the population - the supporters and the opponents of the bridge. The current state government of Rhineland-Palatinate has declared itself against the construction of the bridge in the coalition agreement of 2011; however, in the future the plans might be revived again.

Loreley Rock

The Loreley Rock has a great historical and cultural significance. According to legend, Loreley, a beautiful woman with long golden hair, was sitting on the rock and bewitching sailors who subsequently moved against the rocks and capsized. In fact, many ships have had accidents there in the past since hidden rocks below the water surface were making the passage of the narrow Rhine bend at the Loreley Rock dangerous. The rock, linked with the legend and the figure of the Loreley, is world-renowned and is an integral part of the romantic Rhine and the cultural heritage (Fig. 5). But even here there are always different construction projects that jeopardize the special cultural landscape.

The RVDL has repeatedly introduced statements into the discussion, and it is a member of the steering committee "Redesign of the Loreley Plateau".

Wind turbines

Since the nuclear accident in Fukushima, renewable energies have been increasingly developed in Germany, such as in the fields of biomass, solar and wind energy. In the Upper Middle Rhine Valley there are now concrete plans for the building of wind turbines on the ridge of the valley. They would be widely visible and would significantly affect the landscape. As a homeland association, we welcome the energy transition in principle. However, we warn against endangering the characteristic picture of the historically grown cultural landscape in a particularly sensitive area such as the Middle Rhine Valley. It cannot be possible that, for reason of economic profit or unilateral political decisions, valuable regions are affected. For this purpose, the RVDL, together with other experts of monument conservation and protection of cultural landscapes, prepared differentiated opinions and had talks with political representatives.

Further examples in Germany

The homeland associations in Germany are active in the context of the UNESCO World Heritage in many states. The "Niedersächsische Heimatbund" and the "Schleswig-Holsteinische Heimatbund" were respectively involved in the nomination of the Wadden Sea for the World Heritage List and its preservation. The nomination as World Heritage of the Hamburger Speicherstadt was actively supported by the "Denkmalverein Hamburg". The "Landesheimatbund Sachsen-Anhalt" contributed to the nomination of the planned World Heritage Area "Herrschaftslandschaft in the Saale and Unstrut Valley with the Naumburg Cathedral" by gathering the cultural landscape elements and doing the public relations. A nomination is being prepared also for the "Erzgebirge mining landscape". Here, hundreds of associations have recorded and



Fig. 5: The Loreley Rock is famous worldwide through the legend of the Loreley. Due to building projects, this characteristic cultural landscape is at risk. Photo: Stephan Doempke

kept alive the cultural heritage of the mining region. In Dresden, the BHU Landesverband Sächsischer Heimatschutz has formulated opinions against the construction of the bridge over the Elbe River.

The RVDL and the BHU will contribute again to the public communication of the planned extension request of the “Niedergermanischer Limes”.

Recommendations

The civic engagement of associations and dedicated individuals contribute significantly to the successful shaping of World Heritage areas. Unfortunately, this engagement is not always adequately appreciated and often is insufficiently integrated in planning processes. As a consequence, identification with the World Heritage becomes more complicated, and outreach to a broad basis in society is delayed. It is not surprising then that many citizens ask themselves which advantages the World Heritage Status will offer them - and restrictions imposed by the status are perceived even more negative than the positive effects. On the other hand, politics and administrations are quick to call for civic engagement when low-cost solutions are required. Citizens perceive that quickly as hypocritical or as pseudo-participation. Instead, it is necessary to meet citizens on an equal footing and to motivate them. Especially where a World Heritage nomination was not successful, or the World Heritage Status was even revoked, disappointment will arise among the citizens. In such situations structures must be in effect which continue to support the engagement and do not depend on the World Heritage status alone.

The World Heritage status is not the only aim. The existing engagement for an area or for the homeland of people should be further encouraged and motivated. Otherwise, it will damage the public image of the World Heritage designation.

Last but not least, synergies with other conventions are often missing. Thus, the civic engagement and the mainstream culture are essential supporters regarding the UNESCO Convention on Intangi-

ble Cultural Heritage. The European Landscape Convention of the European Council is focused on the quality targets of landscapes and could be applied with benefit for the management of World Heritage sites. In addition, there are valid methods for participative processes and for the awareness-raising about landscape.

Altogether, the greater involvement of civil engagement would greatly benefit World Heritage sites and landscapes. We therefore ask for:

- Involvement of civil engagement from the beginning and with a permanent perspective;
- Participatory planning and management processes which promote co-responsibility, acceptance and sustained engagement;
- Recognition and appreciation of civic engagement;
- Strengthening of associations and societies (provision of permanent structures and necessary resources);
- Greater involvement of NGOs in the commissions and in the World Heritage decisions;
- Demonstrating how synergies with other conventions can be used in sustainable planning, management and protection of the World Heritage.

Further links

www.civilscape.eu – European federation of NGOs for landscapes in Europe

www.europanostra.org – European federation for cultural heritage in Europe

www.rheinischer-verein.de – Rhenish Association for Monument Conservation and Landscape Protection, active in the Upper Middle Rhine Valley World Heritage Site http://www.rheinischer-verein.de/de/themen/projekte/welterbe_mittelrheintal/standardseite_5.html#dt

Saving the Roman Water System and the Terraced Landscape of Battir, Palestine

Mohammed T. Obidallah, EcoPeace – Friends of the Earth Middle East

Introduction

The Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem – of Battir and its slopes– constitutes a unique pattern of cultural landscape, which was preserved during thousands of years, where agriculture is based on water from springs in the valley conveyed from pools using ancient aqueducts. In spite of the political and military upheavals the region has undergone, Battir in World Heritage terms is considered an organically evolved landscape (EcoPeace 2012).

Within the area there are kilometers of dry-stone walls, necessary to hold the shallow soils on steep, stony slopes. This visually spectacular landscape also contains many other elements: a prehistoric hilltop, fortifications, roman graves, villages of ancient origin, fields of many different type and date, irrigation system and the features that made the landscape work for people struggling to gain a livelihood from it. Overall, these things form a cultural landscape of considerable scientific interest and beauty, especially in a Palestinian context where extents of such quality landscape have become quite rare under the pressures of modern development (EcoPeace 2013). (Fig. 1)




Fig. 1: Battir Village with its terraced landscape which has evolved over thousands of years.

Photo: Mohammed T. Obidallah

The history of Battir starts during the Iron Age II period. It was ruled by the Canaanite, Roman, Byzantine, Islamic, Mamluk, Ottoman, British, and eventually Israeli colonization. In 1890, the Ottoman

administration built a railway line not far from the footpath connection to the main centers of the Arab world like Cairo, Damascus, Beirut, and Mecca which gave the opportunity for travel, and for study and commerce in these cities (UNESCO 2014).

Battir was also connected to main Palestinian cities (Jerusalem, Bethlehem and Hebron) and was known as Jerusalem's "vegetable basket". After 1948, Battir progressively disconnected from Jerusalem, especially after the closure of the railway station which constituted a lifeline to the rest of the Palestinian territory. In 1949, the Government of Jordan and the Israeli government signed an agreement, known as Rhodes Agreement, which reaffirms the ownership of land by the Battir people beyond the Armistice Line. After 1967, this area witnessed the progressive establishment of the so-called "Etzion Block". Israeli unilateral policies and measures in the area, in the past two decades, reinforced this trend: the encircling of the villages and their territory, the progressive expansion of infrastructures for settlements, and the new mobility system implemented through the separation of roads.

This process triggered an increasing socio-economic crisis due to the expropriation and abandonment of agricultural land, reduction of fresh water availability, and increasing dependence on migrants' remittances. As of today, Palestinian farmers from Battir cultivate their land without any reported incident in the area. The Ottoman railway was renovated by the Israeli state administration, which subsequently decided to close the station of Battir, preventing the local inhabitants from using the train.

Battir in danger

In early 2000s the Government of Israel started to build a "Separation Barrier" in the West Bank, which actually surrounds Bethlehem. As of today, a segment of the Separation Barrier is planned to be constructed in Battir, affecting its land, its heritage, its ancient human-made landscape, and depriving its inhabitants from connection to Bethlehem infrastructures and services. These measures, if completed, would result in the absolute isolation of the area from the West Bank and in the irreversible loss of a potential World Heritage site important to both Palestinians and Israelis. (Fig. 2)




Fig. 2: Photographic projection of the planned wall. The landscape would have been disrupted, and Battir would have lost access to the areas shown in brown behind the wall. Photo: Mohammed T. Obidallah

EcoPeace's strategy of bottom-up and top-down

The Good Water Neighbors Project (GWN), the flagship project of EcoPeace/Friends of the Earth Middle East (FoEME), was initiated in 2001 and included 28 communities. FoEME's main objective is to promote environmental peace-building through influencing policy makers and advancing changes in cross-border environmental policies related to shared water resources in Palestine, Jordan and Israel. To achieve these goals, EcoPeace ME applies a two-folded strategy – bottom-up and top-down approaches.

GWN has created real improvement within the water sector by building trust and understanding that has led to common problem-solving and peace-building among communities even in the midst of conflict. It is considered one of the most elaborate and far-reaching water collaboration projects in the Israeli-Palestinian context.

EcoPeace ME works with municipal staff and adult residents in each GWN community to identify and address sources of pollution, advocate for increased water supply, and to find ways to answer the needs of the cross-border communities through projects that protect the shared environmental heritage. EcoPeace Middle East reached out to stakeholders, decision-makers and funding bodies to identify the priority projects that need advancement in each community. Special consideration was given to cross-border water and environmental concerns and initiatives that are likely to reduce sources of tension between neighboring communities and which promote efficient management of water resources. Here EcoPeace Middle East tends to work with a local forum of concerned community activists that help educate decision-makers to support investments that the Priority Initiatives represent.

An evaluation on the Good Water Neighbors Project from 2012-2014 by Butterfly Effect concluded with this encouraging paragraph: "The GWN's strategy of long-term deep work in the communities, sustaining a cross-border communication network, and

insisting on addressing practical tangible results and interests, rather than just peace or cooperation in general, bears fruits. It changes the discourse of those involved with the project and many have adopted the narrative of environmental peace building/cross-border cooperation that the GWN project advances into their professional and personal lives." (EcoPeace 2014)

EcoPeace's efforts

EcoPeace / Friends of the Earth Middle East used a two-fold strategy – bottom-up and top-down – and arranged different activities defending ancient terraced landscape of Battir and the Roman water System against any separation barrier in the area including an expert meeting, studies and surveys, site visits, visits by diplomats, and local, regional and international media. (Fig. 3)



Fig. 3: A public campaign event in Battir organized by EcoPeace.

Photo: Mohammed T. Obidallah

In early December 2012, FoEME petitioned the Israeli High Court requesting that the court prevent the Israeli military from building the Separation Barrier through the agricultural terraces in the Battir area, on the grounds that the barrier would cause irreversible

damage to a natural and cultural heritage site - that the government of Israel was obliged by law to protect. Following an unusual turn of events where the Israel Nature and Parks Authority (NPA) responded in favor of an NGO petition to the High Court of Israel and contrary to the opinion of the Israeli Military, the High Court ruled the case in favor of EcoPeace Middle East and ordered the military to present an alternative plan within 90 days.

despite undisputed expert opinion that the proposed barrier will destroy the heritage values of the site (Turner 2014). The case returned to the High Court for final decision on 29 January 2013. On this day, the High Court of Israel held another hearing on the petition submitted by EcoPeace ME and the Village of Battir objecting to the building of the Separation Barrier in this sensitive landscape.




Fig. 4: The Battir World Heritage Area and Buffer Zone, showing in green the part of the WH property which would have been cut off from the rest.

Map: UNESCO / Battir Village Council

In May 2013, EcoPeace Middle East and the Battir Village Council turned to the Israeli High Court of Justice and obtained an interim injunction to stop the separation barrier from proceeding to be built. In an unprecedented case, the Israeli Nature and Parks Authority joined the objection to the barrier proposed by the Israeli military. The Israeli Nature and Parks Authority responded to the military: "The building of the fence (separation barrier) as currently proposed by the respondents (a 3.5 meters high bolstered metal fence along a 500 meter segment) does not adequately balance, as required, the range of conflicting interests, and does not adequately address the wide and irreversible damage that will be caused to the natural, landscape, and heritage values that exist in the area".

The Israeli military remained unconvinced as to the merit of the environmental claim and was determined to build the barrier,

Although it was thought that this was to be the final hearing, the issue is complex and the court requested further clarifications from the respondents (mainly the Israeli Ministry of Defense) and ordered that both the Israel Railway and the Ministry of Transport join as additional respondents to the petitions. The Court appeared extremely reluctant that the military remove a single stone terrace and asked Israel Railway to consider the possibility that one of the two existing railway tracks be used as the path of a separation fence. The Court also asked the military to detail how gates proposed to be built for farmer access would guarantee access in a manner that is consistent with the traditional Battir farming methods. EcoPeace, supported by expert opinion, elaborated that it was not possible to build the proposed type of physical structure without destroying several hundred meters of ancient stone terrace walls and traditional farming methods of the kind unique to Battir farmers.

Battir nomination as a World Heritage Site

In February 2014, the Palestinian Authority nominated the Western Bethlehem village of Battir for inscription as a World Heritage cultural landscape. The site was submitted as an Emergency Nomination based on current plans to expand the Israeli Separation Barrier through the heart of Battir, putting the integrity of the site in jeopardy. This World Heritage site designation, which would demonstrate Battir's unique historical and global value, is the crux of FoEME's ongoing petition submitted in December 2012 to the Israeli High Court to halt the expansion of the fence. (Fig. 4)

As part of the process, ICOMOS investigated the site and prepared a report to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee recommending rejecting Battir's nomination (ICOMOS 2014). It was then recommended by all involved communities and stakeholders to inscribe Battir as a World Heritage cultural landscape based on its demonstrated Outstanding Universal Value, with a history dating back 4,000 years, older than any comparable terrace system, and its globally unique water-sharing system that is preserved today. The main argument was that the ICOMOS evaluation was based on incomplete information and misunderstanding of the situation due to flaws in the investigation and the Palestinian Authority's mismanagement of the proposal. Criticisms stem from a lack of information, not from a certainty that Battir does not meet the criteria for inscription (Obidallah 2014).

The achievement

On June 20, 2014, EcoPeace - FoEME celebrated the successful efforts to promote Battir's designation as a UNESCO World Heritage Site, and maintained an ongoing campaign including a formal appeal to the Israeli High Court to prevent the planned construction of the Israeli Separation Barrier through the heart of Battir's terraced landscapes. On January 4, 2015, after three years of debate, the Israeli High Court of Justice decided to deny the request of the Israeli military to confirm the legality of the proposed route of the separation barrier that was planned to cut through the unique terraced landscape of Battir which would irreversibly destroy a canal irrigation system that has been sustained since the Roman times.

The efforts and achievements of the GWN project demonstrate that its two-folded strategy of bottom-up and top-down approaches is comprehensive enough to include and be relevant for the various narratives and interests, on the one hand, and focused enough to maintain a high level of coherence that enables an effective realization of its goals, on the other hand.

References

- EcoPeace- Friends of the Earth Middle East (FoEME) 2015, Israeli High court denies request of Israeli military to approve Separation Barrier in Battir, Available from <http://foeme.org/www/?module=media_releases&record_id=138> [4 June, 2015]
- EcoPeace- Friends of the Earth Middle East (FoEME) 2014, The Israeli Government Decided Not to Decide: Netanyahu postponed the Cabinet's vote whether to build the Security Barrier in Battir, a World Heritage site, available from <http://foeme.org/www/?module=media_releases&record_id=134> [21 July, 2015]
- EcoPeace- Friends of the Earth Middle East (FoEME) 2013, The Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem: Battir, Available from: <http://www.foeme.org/uploads/Battir_Landscape_Info_Sheet_FINAL_Dec13.pdf> [29 June, 2015]
- EcoPeace- Friends of the Earth Middle East (FoEME) 2013, Battir's Ancient Irrigated Landscape Declared an Endangered Cultural Site on the World Monument Fund's 2014 'Watch List', available from <http://foeme.org/www/?module=media_releases&record_id=118> [20 May, 2015]
- EcoPeace- Friends of the Earth Middle East (FoEME) 2013, <Israeli High Court of Justice Orders Israeli Military to Halt Building of Separation Wall in Battir, available from <http://foeme.org/www/?module=media_releases&record_id=116> [2 May, 2015]
- EcoPeace- Friends of the Earth Middle East (FoEME) 2013, High Court Accepts the Petition of FoEME Against the Separation Barrier in Battir, Available from: <http://foeme.org/www/?module=media_releases&record_id=109> [13 July 2015]
- EcoPeace- Friends of the Earth Middle East (FoEME) 2012, Israel Nature & Parks Authority in Response to FoEME Petition Against the Separation Barrier in Battir, available from <http://foeme.org/www/?module=media_releases&record_id=116> [11 May, 2015]
- EcoPeace- Friends of the Earth Middle East (FoEME) 2012, Route of Separation Barrier Threatens to Destroy Shared Palestinian / Israeli Cultural Landscape Site, Available from: <http://foeme.org/www/?module=media_releases&record_id=107> [6 June, 2015]
- EcoPeace- Friends of the Earth Middle East (FoEME) 2013, The Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem: Battir, Available from: <http://www.foeme.org/uploads/Battir_Landscape_Info_Sheet_FINAL_Dec13.pdf> [22 July 2015]
- ICOMOS 2014, Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem, Battir (Palestine) No 1492, Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/1492.pdf> [22 July, 2015]
- Obidallah 2014, A supplement on Battir bid for recognition as a World Heritage Cultural Landscape, 2014, Available from: <http://www.slideshare.net/Obidallah/battir-icomos-recommendation-196-36062934> [25 July 2015]
- UNESCO 2014, Palestine: Land of Olives and Vines – Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem, Battir, Available from : <<http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1492.pdf>> [18 July, 2015]

Management Challenges and Civil Society Experience in the Region of Kotor, Montenegro

Aleksandra Kapetanović, EXPEDITIO




Fig. 1: Kotor Region World Heritage site values (left) and the site with its buffer zone and sea area (right).

Maps: Management Plan of Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor, Ministry of Culture of Montenegro, Cetinje, 2011

The Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor

The Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (hereinafter referred to as the Kotor Region) is located in the Boka Kotorska Bay, a unique fjord-like bay on the Adriatic coast of Montenegro. The property was inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1979. It encompasses the best preserved part of the bay, covering its inner portion with an area of 12,000 ha, while in 2011, the buffer zone was defined as encompassing the whole Bay of Boka Kotorska (Fig. 1).

The Outstanding Universal Value of the Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor is embodied in the quality of the archi-

ecture in its fortified and open cities, settlements, palaces and monastic ensembles, and their harmonious integration to the cultivated terraced landscape on the slopes of high rocky hills. The Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor bears unique testimony to the exceptionally important role that it played over centuries in the spreading of Mediterranean cultures into the Balkans.¹ The Kotor Region is inscribed as a cultural property. At the time of its inscription, the World Heritage Convention did not yet categorize sites as cultural landscapes², however it had already been

1 Adoption of Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, WHC-14/38.COM/8E, Paris, 30 April 2014, <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2014/whc14-38com-8E-en.pdf>, p. 103-105

2 The World Heritage Convention recognizes and protects cultural landscapes since 1992.

recognized that the property had Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) because of a successful harmony of monuments and cities in tune with the landscape. Therefore, in 2008, the WH Committee invited the State Party to “consider re-nominating an enlarged area around the bay as a cultural landscape”³. While this has not taken place yet, the greatest challenge for protecting the OUV of the Kotor Region is how the landscape aspect of this complex area is going to be treated.

Key issues regarding protection and management of the Kotor Region

The Kotor Region is an expansive and complex property, especially considering its buffer zone, which is currently being brought under great pressure that is threatening its OUV. In 2003, the Kotor Region was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger since the threats for which it was placed on the list in 1979, i.e. the partial destruction caused by an earthquake, have been reduced through professional restoration. At the same time, other, more serious threats were identified for the first time that year, i.e. the risks that excessive and uncontrolled urbanisation are posing to the OUV of the property. Accelerated urbanization unfortunately still continues on the territory of the protected region and its buffer zone (Fig. 2).



Fig. 2: Boka Kotorska Bay, encompassing the Kotor Region WHS and its Buffer Zone.

of the protection system as a serious problem, as well as its inability to exert a positive influence on the process of urbanization, spatial plans and transport networks. “The protected region has not yet been granted the legal status of cultural landscape; there are no detailed regimes and regulations for the development of spatial and urban plans; decisions made by the protection authorities are not binding; managerial structures are weak and insufficiently coordinated, without a clear vision of development.”⁵

The Advisory Mission Report identifies well the key problems. Additionally, through a detailed analysis of the processes that have been going on lately in the region, and through an analysis of the protection, planning and management system, the following can be added:

- Although progress has been made in certain aspects related to legislative and institutional framework (a new Law on Cultural Properties, adopted in 2010, and the Law on the Protection of the Natural Region and Cultural-Historical Region of Kotor, 2013), in general, the legal framework has many shortcomings when it comes to cultural heritage, especially cultural landscape protection: some aspects are inadequately and insufficiently defined, and the procedures are unclear (e.g. vaguely described procedures for the issuance of conservation conditions or Protection Studies that, as defined by the law, still deal with individual cultural properties only, and not the entire landscape). A particular problem is posed by the fact that the Law on Spatial Development and Construction of Structures is not harmonized with the Law on Cultural Properties. Therefore, there are failures in procedures resulting in the adoption of plans and issuance of building permits without the formal approval of protective institutions⁶.
- The Regional Institute for Cultural Heritage Protection, established in 1980 for the purpose of management and conservation of the Kotor Region, was transformed, under the new law from 2010, into two new units: the Regional Unit of the Directorate for Protection of Cultural Property and the Regional Unit of the Centre for Conservation and Archaeology of Montenegro. Although this transformation of protection institutions has led to the improvement of some aspects of protection, the total system has been weakened, and the two newly-formed units have less competences and reduced capacities.

This was confirmed by the Advisory Mission in 2013⁴, which concluded that the link between spatial planning and protection policy is rather weak and that spatial and urban plans tolerate and, to a certain degree, encourage this urbanization, while they fail to sufficiently integrate the requirements for the protection of OUV and cultural landscape attributes. The mission identified the weakness

- The 2011 Management Plan for the Kotor Region was developed with the participation of all relevant stakeholders’ representatives. The new Law on the Protection of the Kotor Region, adopted in 2013, envisages the formation of a Management Council for the Kotor Region, with the role to coordinate the activities of protection and management of the site. However, the Council has not yet begun implementing the Plan. Furthermore, according to the Law, the Coun-

3 Decisions adopted at the 32nd Session of the World Heritage Committee (Quebec City, 2008), WHC-08/32.COM/24Rev, 31 March 2009, Decision : 32 COM 7B.101, Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Montenegro) (C 125), <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/1708>, p.124-125

4 Report of the Advisory Mission for the Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Montenegro), 25-31 March 2013, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/125/documents/>

5 Report of the Advisory Mission for the Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Montenegro), 25-31 March 2013, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/125/documents/>

6 The Report on state of conservation in 2014 states that the Detailed urban plan (DUP) for Dobrota was adopted without prior approval of the Administration for cultural heritage protection, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/125/documents/>

cil does not include representatives of the municipalities on the territories to which the buffer zone extends, and competences of the Council are not compatible with its representative membership.

In addition, it is important to note some general issues related to the national context that have a major impact on the identified problems, such as:

- the system's institutions have been weakened in the process of transition;
- corruption, especially in the field of spatial planning and construction⁷;
- lack of long-term planning, in general and especially related to tourism (Fig. 3).
- It is also important to mention that the State of Conservation Reports do not give a complete picture of real threats and condition at the site.



Fig. 3: Due to a dramatic increase in tourism, urban sprawl is taking over ever larger parts of the inner bay. Settlement of Dobrota. Photo: Expeditio

There is also the general attitude of the softening of problems and the WH requirements. Draft decisions made at the 2014 WH Committee Meeting included an article stating: *"Halt any building or infrastructure development projects within the property until such time as the necessary planning and management tools have been finalized and put into practice"*.⁸ However, after discussion on the meeting, and despite the advisory bodies' clear recommendations, this article was re-formulated into: *"Encourages controlled implementation of developments in Morinj, Kostanjica and Glavati and requests the State Party to undertake Heritage Impact Assessment to ensure that no impact occurs on Outstanding Universal Value."*⁹ (Fig. 4).

7 EU-Montenegro Stabilisation and Association Parliamentary Committee (SAPC), Declaration and Recommendations from the 10th EU-Montenegro SAPC meeting in Budva on 8-9 April 2015, https://polcms.secure.europarl.europa.eu/cmsdata/upload/776bf42b-e88e-49f3-9357-b4fa59b54f86/Recommendations_10th%20SAPC%20-%20EN.pdf

8 Draft Decision: 38 COM 7B.30, Item 7B of the Provisional Agenda: State of conservation of World Heritage properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, WHC-14/38.COM/7B, Paris, 30 April 2014, <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2014/whc14-38com-7B-en.pdf>, p. 41-43

9 Decision: 38 COM 7B.29, Decisions adopted by World Heritage Committee at its 38th Session (Doha, 2014), WHC-14/38.COM/16, Doha, 7 July 2014, <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2014/whc14-38com-16en.pdf>, p. 82-83



Fig. 4: Due to the steeply ascending terrain, inappropriate construction development has an immediate effect on the visual integrity of the cultural landscape. Settlement of Dobrota. Photo: Expeditio

Civil society activities

In the area of the Kotor Region, different civil society organizations are active in the field of cultural heritage, ranging from informal and small local to professional ones.

Several traditional associations of citizens that have existed in Kotor for a long time have a special status as they are important for the safeguarding of different segments of intangible heritage. One of them is the Boka Navy – a confraternity of the seamen of Boka Kotorska, established in 1859, tracing its origin back to the mid-15th century. There are a number of smaller local NGOs committed to safeguarding the heritage of some settlements, such as "Kamelija" from Stoliv and "Association of Friends of Perast", organizing mainly traditional local events. Over the past few years numerous local initiatives and organizations have been promoting traditional music, masked balls and carnivals, cuisine, crafts such as the making of Dobrota lace, or the safeguarding of wooden boats and the knowledge to restore them.

Activities focusing on heritage presentation and popularization are the most common, resulting in the realization of publications, exhibitions, websites, presentations, round table discussions, etc. A smaller number of organizations occasionally conduct concrete conservation activities, like the village councils for churches restoration, restoration of graves by the Community of Italians of Montenegro, restoration camps etc. One of the most recent cross-border projects, titled "Heritage - Driver of Development", was implemented by two local NGOs and the local government and dealt with issues related to cultural landscape, with a special focus on cooperation between stakeholders and participatory process, knowledge enhancing and sharing, capacity-building as well as awareness-raising.

There are just few professional NGOs in the Kotor Region, such as the Centre for Preservation and Presentation of Kotor's Documentary Heritage, or "Notar", attracting mainly archivists, and EXPE-

DITIO, Centre for Sustainable Spatial Development. EXPEDITIO, founded in 1997 and run by architects, is active in the fields of cultural heritage and landscape protection, sustainable architecture, urban/rural planning and civil society development. The majority of EXPEDITIO's numerous cross-disciplinary projects and activities have been implemented within the Region of Kotor, addressing its various aspects, through developing studies and researches, organizing events (lectures, seminars, exhibitions, etc.), architectural workshops, restoration camps, as well as advocacy activities, campaigns, publishing, actions in public spaces, and so on (Fig. 5). As part of its professional engagement, EXPEDITIO also launches appeals and provides comments and recommendations in respect to urban plans, strategies, laws, etc. EXPEDITIO members took part in the process of preparing the Management Plan for the Kotor Region, and will represent the NGO sector in a Managing Council that is still to begin functioning. This is going to be the biggest challenge regarding the CSOs' involvement in the process of World Heritage management.

In conclusion, it can be said that in the Kotor Region there are not many organizations or initiatives dealing solely with World Heritage issues. Although different representatives of the civil sector contribute to World Heritage area protection through different activities, so far, unfortunately, they have not been able to considerably influence the key on-going processes.



Fig. 5: An illustration of Expeditio's activities.

Photo: Expeditio

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Retrospective Statement of OUV, adopted in 2014, identifies the framework that will be essential to ensure protection of the Kotor Region: *Increased awareness to treat the inscribed property and the buffer zone as an integral part of the unique cultural landscape of the Boka Kotorska Bay is needed. Challenges remain for*

*the further definition of common development strategies for the property and its buffer zone, for integrated planning and for the establishment of an overall management system.*¹⁰

The Advisory Mission from 2013 defines a recommendation that should serve as the basis for all further activities related to the improvement of protection policies, spatial and urban planning policies, transport network and technical support.

All the issues posing problems for the protection of the Kotor Region are connected, and they should be addressed in an integral way. However, in our opinion, at this moment the most urgent would be to *halt problematic development projects*¹¹ and to give priority to the following:

1. harmonizing the protection and planning policies,
2. changing and harmonizing the legal framework,
3. reviewing and activating the system of management of the property.

All these should be followed by capacity-strengthening, education, promotion, and awareness-raising.

Civil society should take part in these processes, and their role could be to:

- contribute to initiating activities and processes (such as, changing the legal system);
- actively be involved in different segments of protection and management (such as being represented in the Management Council, and contribute to the preparation of State of Conservation Reports);
- encourage cooperation and partnership with state institutions and other stakeholders/ fostering participatory processes;
- continue to draw attention to problems;
- monitor the condition of the Property.

This would require a coordinated activity of CSOs and their involvement in the processes related to World heritage protection and management, as well as the readiness of institutions to cooperate.

If Montenegro does not start addressing these issues, we seriously risk losing the OUV of the Kotor Region and being removed from the World Heritage List. It is a great challenge for the civil society in general to contribute to future protection, planning and management of the Historical Region of Kotor WH site.

¹⁰Adoption of Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value, WHC-14/38.COM/8E, Paris, 30 April 2014, <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2014/whc14-38com-8E-en.pdf>, p. 103-105

¹¹Draft Decision: 38 COM 7B.30, Item 7B of the Provisional Agenda: State of conservation of World Heritage properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, WHC-14/38.COM/7B, Paris, 30 April 2014, <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2014/whc14-38com-7B-en.pdf>, p. 41-43

Engendering Civil Society Mobilization in four Cultural Landscapes of Nigeria

Dr. Musa Oluwaseyi Hambolu, Veritas University

Nigeria has two World Heritage Sites and eleven others on the tentative list. An examination of the process leading to the inscription of Sukur and Osogbo shows that they were essentially government driven with substantial support from expatriate scholars and individuals. Though the official documents emphasize the role of local communities in the processes, it is clear that the processes adopted were essentially top-down approaches. The reason for this can be firmly located in the absence of robust Non-Governmental Organizations and Civil Society Organizations in the cultural sectors. While we have numerous stakeholders at these World Heritage Sites, they do not have the required financial strength to be independent and do in fact sometimes work at cross purposes.

As espoused by several perceptive scholars and heritage practitioners, there are indeed no monolithic communities at these sites in addition to the fact that heritage is inherently a contested phenomenon. As a stakeholder-driven process the need for conflict management skills for heritage workers cannot be overemphasized. It is indeed worthy of note that Nigeria, though she has ratified the World Heritage Convention, she is yet to domesticate it to create a link with national heritage laws. There is therefore the need to create a National World Heritage Watch as an NGO or CSO comprising of different stakeholders capable of driving the process of nominating, inscription and maintenance of World Heritage Sites in Nigeria.

Sukur Cultural Landscape

Sukur Cultural Landscape was declared World Heritage Site in 1999 under UNESCO cultural criteria iii, v and vi. Sukur is an ancient hilltop settlement on the Mandara Mountains on the border of Nigeria and Cameroun. Constructed of dry stone walling, it has a recorded history of iron smelting technology, flourishing trade and strong political institutions dating back to the 16th century AD.

Sukur Cultural Landscape has remained essentially the same for many centuries. The highlight of the challenges being faced includes faithful implementation of management plans, conflict between upper and lower Sukur occupants, conflict also between the elites that dominate the management committee and the trad-

itional ruler. These issues were in the process of being addressed when Boko Haram attacked settlements around the foot of Sukur Plateau in October 2014. About 5000 people who escaped death



Fig. 1: Burnt houses in Sukur after the attack by Boko Haram.

Photo: Stefan Kiehas and Simon Zira

sought refuge on the Sukur Cultural Landscape, far in excess of the carrying capacity of the site. Then on December 12th 2014, Boko Haram raided Sukur, killing people, burning houses, and stealing livestock and other goods. The residence of the chief was burnt along with 173 other residences. The chief's residence is an iconic element in the World Heritage Cultural Landscape.

Osun Osogbo Sacred Grove

Osun Osogbo sacred grove was inscribed into the World Heritage list in 2005 under UNESCO cultural criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi). The grove is undisturbed matured rain forest vegetation dissected by the majestic meandering river. The grove is the abode of Osun, the goddess of fertility. It consists of rich historical, traditional, religious, spiritual, architectural and artistic values of cultural significance and universal value. It is a symbol of traditional Yoruba practices among the Yoruba ethnic group in Africa and in the Diaspora. Main challenges are dearth of traditional skills necessary

for the sustenance of the core values of the site, conflicting stakeholders' interests; excessive tourism at peak period, and pollution of the river.



Fig. 2: Osun Osogbo Sacred Grove: The Shrine.

Photo: Naija Things

Oke Idanre Cultural Landscape

First submitted for consideration of the WH Committee in 2008, Oke Idanre was the highest hill-top settlement in south west Nigeria to have an elaborate settlement structure at the apex of which was a palace that symbolizes and epitomized the political architecture of pre-colonial Yorubaland. It remains the focal point for



Fig. 3: Oke Idanre Cultural Landscape: The King's Palace.

Photo: ojojoshua.wordpress.com

many annual cycles of festivals. The Owa's Palace and remains of a house containing the burial of the last king, a 19th century District Officers residence, a school, colonial courthouse as well as shrines that continue to attract large number of pilgrims for special annual festivals, are preserved. ICOMOS carried out an evaluation mission in preparation for WH Committee 2011 and recommended that the site should not be inscribed. The State Party voluntarily withdrew the nomination with a view to submitting a fresh application.

Kano City Walls and Associated Sites

Submitted in 2013, under criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi), Kano City Walls is an earth-built defensive wall that defines the boundaries of Kano Ancient City and its enclosed settlement quarters. The urban heritage components which are regarded as the associated sites are the Emir's Palace, Kofar Mata Dye Pits, the Gidan Makama Museum and Dala Hill, all enclosed within the city walls. This cultural site represents the best cultural tradition of history of state formation, kingship institution, traditional festivals, local industrial production and the trans-Saharan trade. The site is one of the pilot projects being considered by the WH Committee under the upstreaming process. The challenges being encountered here are encroachment on the historic walls, the realities of a continuously evolving Kurmi market, inappropriate developments around the Dala hills, menace of refuse at the foot of the hill, lack of proper documentation to illustrate the transformation of Gidan Makama to its present multiple roles, and the management of the dye pits being less than well-organized.

Discussion of the two World Heritage Sites

Sukur

Sukur for now is indeed a traumatized community. Relief assistance has not been sufficient, and conditions will remain strait until the next harvest season. The Sukur people need urgent assistance now at the onset of the planting period. This is needed to tide them over until harvest.

While the insurgents are no longer within the World Heritage Site core area; they however remain a threat as they still carry out sporadic attacks in the plains. Though the new government in Nigeria has put in place strategies that will degrade the capacities of the insurgents, we need also to put in place a trained local vigilante specifically for the site. This would be a good stop-gap measure that can be coordinated by NGOs and Civil Societies until government might be able to deploy military/security forces – if ever – on a permanent basis in and around the site.

The destruction of buildings compromises the integrity of the cultural landscape. However, we must be alert also to the dangers of compromising integrity of the site in the process of rebuilding. Therefore, the reconstruction and restoration process must be closely supervised, and should indeed afford opportunities for the younger ones to be trained by the aged in the art of traditional constructions. This is indeed a pressing issue, for if we delay any further, we should not expect the people to wait indefinitely before rebuilding their lives in ways that might compromise the integrity of the site.

There is an urgent need for the World Heritage Committee to allocate assistance to save this endangered World Heritage Site.



Fig. 4: Gidan Makama Museum: A Key Element in the Kano Cultural Landscape.

Photo: National Commission for Museums and Monuments, Nigeria

Mainstreaming Sukur stakeholders as active and equal participants in this process is critical.

Osun-Osogbo

The new management plan seeks to tackle the problems of carrying capacity of the site and prevent pollution of the river from source rather than the current retroactive practice of quarterly cleaning. There has been progress in reconciling conflicts of interest of different stakeholders. As funding is pretty scarce for the site, a vibrant NGO would be needed to effectively source for required resources and implement required interventions.

Discussion of Kano and Idanre nominated sites

Monitoring and reporting state of the properties, mobilising resources for intervention when required, report-writing and publications, the development of a multi-disciplinary research plan to amplify the outstanding universal value, reviewing the management plan; establishing a sustainable conservation programme, developing site-presentation strategies revolving around the values and attributes of the sites would require the intervention of NGOs and CSOs.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The economic downturn in Nigeria is going to affect the already anemic government funding of the culture sector. While in other climes, economic down would force an introspection that might

highlight the importance of World Heritage Sites as revenue generating endeavours, I do not foresee this happening in Nigeria without intensive advocacy on the part of NGOs and CSOs. I however, do not see our intervention as a case of taking up the duties of failed governmental agencies; rather as mediators or facilitators of mutual understanding between state actors and original owners of the heritage; facilitators between states actors and international users of these cultural sites and mobilisers of resources when and where needed.

In line with World Heritage Watch objectives, there is a need to raise awareness of the general population, improving participation in decision-making processes, facilitating cultural activities related to world heritage, developing world heritage tourism and facilitating training of professionals. Evolving a stakeholder governance framework is a task that calls for the engendering of virile NGOs and CSOs in Nigeria's heritage sector. The World Heritage Watch should consider fostering a Nigerian Chapter.

References

I utilized documents made available to me by Nigeria's State Party represented by the National Commission for Museums and Monuments (NCMM).

Nicholas David and Judith Sterner (2015): Request for inscription of the *Sukur World Heritage Cultural Landscape on the List of World Heritage in Danger on account of the Boko Haram insurgency*.

Empowering the Local Community for the Management of the Subak Landscape of Bali

Wiwik Dharmiasih, Yayasan Konservasi Sawah Bali¹, and Yunus Arbi, Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia

“The Cultural Landscape of Bali Province (CLBP): The Subak System as a Manifestation of the Tri Hita Karana (THK) Philosophy” (Fig. 1) represents the Balinese irrigation system known as *subak*, a unique social and religious institution, a self-governing, democratic organization of farmers who share responsibility for the just and efficient




Fig. 1: The subak landscapes of Bali.

Map: <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1194rev.pdf> p. 1-6

use of irrigation water to grow paddy rice (Ministry of Culture and Tourism and Government of Bali Province 2011). Religious rituals, which are closely linked to the stages of rice growth, dominate the activities of *subak* members. Thus, *subak* has been labeled as a socio-religious irrigation institution that distinguishes it from most of the irrigation systems in the world (Sutawan 2004).

This democratic and egalitarian water management system exemplifies the ancient philosophical principle of THK – “three causes of prosperity and happiness” – in the Hindu-Balinese belief. It promotes a balanced relationship between human and the realm of the spirits (*parhyangan*), human and human (*pawongan*), and human and nature (*palemahan*) (Ministry of Culture and Tourism and Government of Bali 2011). This ancient philosophy influences the daily lives of the Balinese including in farming. *Parhyangan* is reflected through rituals and ceremonies performed by farmers

to Gods and Goddesses in water-associated temples and shrines to get blessings in doing their agricultural work. Every farmer performs individual offerings and ceremonies, as well as communal offerings and ceremonies through their *subak* organization. In the spirit of *pawongan* in the *subak* system, the balanced relationship between humans can be observed through water sharing management, planting, harvesting, rituals and ceremonies to water-associated temples.

The harmonious relationship with nature (*palemahan*) is clearly exposed in the beauty of rice terraces, water canals, dams and weirs built of stones and trees’ branches, and the sustainable management of forests, lakes and springs as water reservoirs (Fig. 2). Farmers in Bali consider rice fields as sacred places; therefore they protect them by local bylaws called *awig-awig*. The *subak* system, in conjunction with the network of water-associated temples, has managed the ecology of rice terraces at the scale of the whole watershed. It has shaped the landscape and has been managed by local communities for centuries (UNESCO 2012a). However, current development pressures following the growing attention the site received after its inscription are threatening the cultural landscape. At the time of inscription, UNESCO (2014a) has suggested that the *subak* system was highly vulnerable, and that a scheme to support traditional practices of the *subak* communities through their engagement in the management of the property was needed.



Fig. 2: In the more remote interior of Bali, there is little visible impact on the traditional ways of life.

Photo: weAdapt

¹ Bali Rice Field Conservation Foundation

Threats and challenges

The Ministry of Education and Culture (2012), in its response to the evaluation of ICOMOS and IUCN regarding the nomination of the CLBP, has identified three categories of threats to CLBP: natural causes, economic and social changes, and policy-making. Natural causes such as climate change have affected rain patterns and disrupted water supply that influence rice production. Drought is often detected due to extreme climate, and the number of springs has fallen significantly in recent years. Social and economic changes also bring substantial pressures to the landscape. Population growth and uncontrolled development lead to land conversion and deforestation. Illegal use of forested areas causes deterioration in water catchment services, increases soil erosion, and undermines the sustainable supply of forest products. The increasing numbers of visitors to the CLBP present rapid and unplanned growth of commercial development such as new roads, restaurants, retail shops and others.



Fig. 3: Participants of the Forum Pekaseh Catur Angga Batukau.

Photo: Samdhana Institute

Insufficient income from farming resulted in the increasing sale of farmlands, changes in principal occupation leading to the disintegration of *subak*, outmigration particularly among youth, and change in ritual practices. This in turn affects the local values and appreciation of the property as well as active participation in conservation efforts.

Various stakeholders involved in the management of the CLBP create overlapping policies especially in the spatial management of the sites. *Subak* as an integrated water management system is now divided based on their administrative locations, and often-times their needs cannot be fulfilled due to the confusing roles of different government agencies that manage the property. Different interests of every stakeholder produce diverse policies, and very often the community - particularly farmers - are disregarded in the decision-making process. An adaptive co-management approach was introduced to meet the challenges in creating an effective management system. Through this co-management approach it was expected that various interests and policies can be accommodated and every stakeholder involved can be engaged in implementing the management plan of the CLBP.

Forum Pekaseh Catur Angga Batukau

The Government of Indonesia, through the Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC) collaborating with Universitas Udayana (Unud), the Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI)-Asia, and Samdhana Institute held a *subak* meeting (*musyawarah subak* or *musbak*) on 11-12 May 2014 in Wongaya Gede, one of the *subaks* in the Subak Landscape of Catur Angga Batukaru (CAB), Tabanan Regency. The idea of having a *musbak* emerged from common issues raised by farmers within the World Heritage Site such as taxes, low income, lack of government support, and other agricultural challenges. This was conducted following the request of the Government of Indonesia in 2013 for SEI to support the development of a participatory and effective management structure for the CLBP (SEI 2015).

CAB covers a total area of 17,376.1 ha with buffer zones of 974.4 ha making it the largest area among other sites within the CLBP (Ministry of Culture and Tourism and Government of Bali Province 2011). It includes forests, temples and *subak*, villages and lakes, as well as springs and rivers, representing the complexity of the *subak* ecosystem. It features 20 *subaks* with more than 2,500 farmers as its members. Thus, this site faces greater threats and challenges in its management and preservation.

The *musbak* was attended by 20 *subak* heads (*pekaseh*) within CAB and continued for two days (Fig. 3). Representatives from respected community groups such as elders from the Kingdom of Tabanan and priests (*pemangku*) of temples within CAB attended the *musbak* on the second day. Independent facilitators were invited to facilitate the whole process and to guarantee the neutrality of the two-day program.

The goal of this *musbak* was to build and strengthen the capacity of the *pekasehs* as the native guardians of the landscape, as well as to establish understanding among them in the management and preservation of CAB as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. Those *pekasehs* shared issues encountered in their *subaks* and developed a collective action plan to address them (SEI 2015).

The whole process was delivered in a participatory approach, allowing maximum input and active participation of the *pekasehs*. The *musbak* successfully established a forum of communication and coordination among *pekasehs*, which is called *Forum Pekaseh Catur Angga Batukau* (often mentioned only with *forum pekaseh*). The name *Batukau* was chosen following their decision to use the initial name of the site instead of the official name used in the World Heritage inscription.

The formation of *forum pekaseh* parallels the scheme of the World Heritage Committee through the Suwon Action Plan (UNESCO 2012b) to ensure the engagement of local communities in the management and decision-making process and sharing of benefits. The establishment of the *forum pekaseh* expresses a significant

involvement of local community in the management of the World Heritage Site. The *forum pekaseh* appointed a head of the forum and established regular meetings to discuss the management plan and monitoring programs. They also created *awig-awig*, a written legal code that details the rights and responsibilities of the *forum pekaseh* and its members. This traditional legal system is expected to reduce problems and suppress conflict that might occur among its members. The 20 *pekasehs* formalized the *awig-awig* with the King of Tabanan and the highest priest (*pemangku gede*) of CAB in order to avoid political influence of the government and to show the inseparable relationship between the *subak*, the royal family, and the priests (SEI 2015). This shows the strong connection between *parhyangan*, *pawongan*, and *palemahan* in the management of the *subak* system in Bali.



Fig. 4: Participatory mapping by the *Pekaseh*.

Photo: Samdhana Institute

The growing number of external influences on the *subak* system has prompted the needs to combine indigenous knowledge and current technology. MoEC, Unud, SEI-Asia, and Samdhana Institute in November 2014 presented a participatory mapping training to the *forum pekaseh* as a continued capacity-building effort to the local community in the management of the CLBP (Fig. 4).

Pekaseh, to actively participate in that management process, need to recognize their *subak* area. Thus, every *pekaseh* was introduced and trained to use the Global Positioning System (GPS) and to do mapping of their own *subaks*. GPS helps farmers in providing digital location and time information of each *subak* to record their rice field areas and water flow in the irrigation system. Through this participatory mapping, every *pekaseh* is able to record every change that happens and each challenge that occurs in their *subaks* particularly in their irrigation network (SEI 2015). This process will support the monitoring program of the CLBP whose purpose is to take preventive action, management, and reporting of the state of conservation of the site.

Conclusion

The Cultural Landscape of Bali Province is a living heritage that has existed for millennia. *Forum Pekaseh Catur Angga Batukau* was established as a solution to return the management to the rights-holders of the landscape. This transformation has created a bottom-up approach in the management of the World Heritage Site in Bali. This suits the model of adaptive co-management by involving active participation of the local communities. This process raised awareness to the farmers not only as recipients of government support but also as managers of the sites.

This has led to a significant change in site management because it has created communication and coordination between the needs of the local community and policy-making by the government. Since the establishment of the Forum, the *pekaseh* have been actively engaged and are always present in meetings related to the implementation of the management plan, both at the regency and provincial levels. In September 2014, they were involved in the making of a Joint Action Plan for the management of the CLBP, in the meeting of the Coordination and Communication Forum for the Management of the CLBP lead by the Cultural Office of Bali Province.

Forum pekaseh also actively reports issues and challenges they encounter in the field that is considered threatening the Outstanding Universal Values of the cultural landscape. Government agencies, together with academics and non-governmental organizations, should continue their roles in supporting and facilitating the capacity-building of local communities toward a sustainable management of World Heritage Sites reinforcing conservation, capacity-building, communication, credibility and community involvement.

References

- Ministry of Education and Culture 2012, *Response to the Evaluation of ICOMOS and IUCN regarding the Nomination of the Cultural Landscape of Bali Province*, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Ministry of Culture and Tourism and Government of Bali Province 2011, *Cultural Landscape of Bali Province, Nomination for inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List*. Available from: <<http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1194rev.pdf>>. [29 May 2015].
- UNESCO 2012a, *Decision 36 COM 8B.26, Cultural Properties – Cultural Landscape of Bali Province: the Subak System as a Manifestation of the Tri Hita Karana Philosophy (Indonesia)*. Available from: <<http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4797>>. [2 June 2015].
- UNESCO 2012b, *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. Available from: <<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2012/whc12-36com-10A-en.pdf>>. [2 June 2015].
- UNESCO 2014a, *State of Conservation (SOC) Cultural Landscape of Bali Province: The Subak System as a Manifestation of the Tri Hita Karana Philosophy*. Available from: <<http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc/2815>>. [29 May 2015].
- Stockholm Environment Institute 2015, *Project Report 2015-05, Managing a living cultural landscape: Bali's subaks and the UNESCO World Heritage Site*. Available from: <<http://www.sei-international.org/mediamanager/documents/Publications/SEI-PR-2015-05-Bali-Cultural-Landscape-LR.pdf>>. [4 June 2015].
- Sutawan, Nyoman 2004, *Tri Hita Karana and Subak – In Search for Alternative Concept of Sustainable Irrigated Rice Culture*. Available from: <http://www.maff.go.jp/e/nousin/kaigai/inwepf/i_document/pdf/sympo_sutawan.pdf>. [29 May 2015].

IV. Local Communities, Indigenous Peoples, Governments and UNESCO



The World Heritage Convention and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

Moderator: Elke Falley-Rothkopf
(Institute for Ethnology and Action Anthropology)

Indigenous Peoples Participation in the Management of Bystrinsky Nature Park, Kamchatka

Dr. Victoria N. Sharakhmatova, Assotsiatsiya korennykh malochislennykh narodov severa, Kamchatskovo kraiy¹

In December 1996, the Bystrinsky Nature Park was included into the UNESCO World Heritage List as one of six protected areas within the nomination "Volcanoes of Kamchatka" (Fig. 1). The Park is unique due to its virgin, almost undisturbed natural landscapes with a predominant mountainous relief, deciduous forests and well-preserved traditional nature use forms of indigenous communities.

Bystrinsky Nature Park is the key element of the protected area network in Central Kamchatka due to its large size and intact ecosystems found mainly at regional geomorphological structures.

The volcanoes of Kamchatka Nature Park are a sacred land for the indigenous peoples of Northern Russia. Since ancient times, indigenous cultures knew about the significance and influence of such land on the ecological, geological, and geophysical state of the planet. As a result, indigenous peoples have developed a strict *modus vivendi* ethic system in such lands. However, modern, uncontrolled consumption of natural resources (water, biological, animal and plant life) and negligence of environmental regulations in protected areas threaten to destroy the basis for sustainable development of the territory and the community as a whole.




Fig. 1: The five protected areas which form the Volcanoes of Kamchatka World Heritage Property.

Map: Sidorenko / Roskartografia

¹ Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Kamchatka Region

The economic content of traditional use of nature among the indigenous peoples of Northern Russian is based on the fact that the livelihoods of geographically and demographically stable populations depends on historical sustainable use of biological natural

resources of the area of their residence. Yet, in terms of economic science, the traditional economic system is only able to provide the way of life for indigenous peoples living close to the primitive society, with a low consumption and extremely poor material basis for social development (Fig. 2).



Fig. 2: Preparing salmon in a camp near Anavgay village. Photo: Sharakhmatova

Therefore, the lifestyle based only on traditional resources, forms, methods and final products, and only on the „territory of traditional nature use“, can hardly provide the means for survival and development of the peoples of the North (Sharakhmatova 2003). Any further development of these peoples requires external resources in addition to traditional natural ones.

The traditional use of nature by indigenous peoples of the North is balanced and limited by objectives of conservation and protection of cultural and historical heritage (Moiseev 1999). As research shows, natural resources and facilities of the Bystrinsky Nature Park provide both aesthetic and economic benefits to a number of different users. In accordance with the methodology of the UN System of Environmental-Economic Accounting, the flow of benefits from the use of natural resources and ecosystem services is the main economic value of the territory. Therefore, the environmental policy of the Bystrinsky Nature Park should be aimed at preserving (maintaining) and increasing the value of the natural resources and ecosystem services in terms of strict compliance with environmental regimes (Fomenko et al. 2010).

By taking into account these historical and cultural features, the regulations at the Nalychevo and Bystrinsky Nature Parks recognize preservation and maintenance of the traditional ways of life for indigenous peoples of Kamchatka as one of the objectives of park development. Moreover, for this purpose, the document foresees the creation of special allocated zones (areas) for traditional use of nature (Management Plan of Bystrinsky Nature Park 2003; Management Plan of Nalychevo Nature Park 2003) (Fig. 3).

In 2010, the experts of the Kadastr Research Institute carried out a study on the topic „Ecological and Economic Evaluation of Eco-




Fig. 3: Zoning of Bystrinsky Nature Park. Map: Management Plan of Bystrinsky Nature Park (2003)

system Services of the Bystrinsky Nature Park as a Basis for the Biological Diversity Preservation” (Fomenko et al. 2010). Based on the economic evaluation of the natural resources and ecosystem services of the Volcanoes of Kamchatka Nature Park (Bystrinsky cluster), benefits of different groups of natural resources users and their comparison with the costs of preserving the natural resources system, some proposals were formulated for the further development of the Bystrinsky Nature Park. These proposals are also significant for the improvement of the protected area management in Kamchatka (Fig. 4).



Fig. 4: Reindeer herding in Bystrinsky Nature Park. Photo: Sharakhmatova

The research shows that the Bystrinsky Nature Park could potentially provide natural resources and ecosystem services for a total of 1.046.095.400 Rubles a year. However, a comparative economic evaluation of the Bystrinsky Nature Park and protected areas of Alaska have revealed lower economic values of the Park recently. It means that the costs from natural resource and ecosystem service users, as well as the benefits to local inhabitants whose well-being depends on the use of the Park's natural resources, are lower.

Moreover, this also indicates a weak inclusion of the Bystrinsky Nature Park into the social and economic development of Bystrinsky municipal district and the Kamchatka region as a whole. Taking into account the financial and economic crisis, as well as the fact that the Nature Park covers more than a half of Bystrinsky district, we can predict that further isolation of the Park from the economy of the district and the whole Kamchatka region will limit development of the Park already in the near future.



Fig. 5: Indigenous reindeer herder in Bystrinsky Nature Park. Photo: Sharakhmatova

For solutions to these problems, the expert evaluations of the territory were conducted in correspondence with three possible development vectors, such as „Inertia“, „Reservation“ and „Sustainable Growth“. The vector „Sustainable Growth“ seems to be the most appropriate, because it not only contributes to natural resource preservation, but also does not lead to the worsening of the economic and social situation. Therefore, exactly this vector should be the basis for recommendations for the Bystrinsky Nature Park development and the creation of mechanisms to regulate (or

prevent) conflicts between the biodiversity conservation efforts, economic use of the Park, the creation of optimal Park borders, and preventing a decrease in value of the UNESCO World Heritage Site „Volcanoes of Kamchatka“ (Fomenko et al. 2010).

It has become clear recently that the involvement of the local population and local communities in the planning and management of the protected areas should be a key task for environmental agencies (Management Plan of Bystrinsky Nature Park 2003). Analysis of international experience allows us to formulate the advantages and consequences for local and indigenous peoples as follows:

- It improves the quality and comprehensiveness of information;
- It improves the credibility and legitimacy of the planning process;
- It increases local support and ownership of the management process;
- It leads to local capacity development;
- It leads to improvements in sustainable development and biodiversity conservation;
- It adds local economic benefits, provides alternative livelihoods and leads to poverty alleviation;
- It facilitates the inclusion of local environmental conservation into local and national sustainable development programmes and policies;
- It is a commitment contained in the Convention on Biological Diversity; and
- It is a requirement of the Global Environmental Facility.

Thus, the long-term co-management techniques of protected areas allow the possibility to solve many problems, and they have been increasingly important in many countries in providing economic and other incentives for environment conservation.

In essence, the term ‘co-management’ refers to a variety of methods and approaches designed to provide legal rights to a community to ensure that it benefits from the existence of the protected area and the sustainable legal use of the resources within the area. As it has been demonstrated in many different circumstances, the local population act more responsibly and more interested in conservation biodiversity if they can see a real benefit from their participation (Fig. 5).

Therefore, it would be very helpful to conduct an assessment of the possibility of community co-management on the territory of the Volcanoes of Kamchatka Natural Park, including a detailed evaluation of legal approaches to involve the local population into the management of protected areas.

While considering the potential of co-management, the following elements need to be analyzed:

- overall co-management feasibility,
- co-management process planning (preparation, development and implementation),

- co-management agreement design,
- informal collaboration,
- strengthened traditional approaches vs. new tools,
- formal legal contracts and instruments,
- sectoral benefit-sharing agreements (e.g. forestry, medicinal plants), and
- regional development agreements.

The co-management is also necessary because saving wildlife and nature should be part of the moral values and norms of human society. Thus, preventing the exhaustion of natural resources has been a key task for society for a long time, which is reflected in consumer habits, traditions, beliefs, myths, rituals and taboos. As for nowadays, the environmental traditions and values remain the most important factors in consciousness and behavior in the education of young people.

Consequentially, the issue of correct balance in the distribution of benefits from the use of natural resources is extremely important for the local population. Especially when it concerns indigenous peoples who live in nature and depend on its sustainable use and conservation, as well as on error management of biodiversity or conservation (vs. traditional wisdom). This is why it is highly important to provide an analysis for every instrument suggested to be applied on natural territory, and to monitor potential conflict situations between different users of the natural resources, including traditional users of the ecosystem services and its complex systems.

References

- Moiseev R. (1999), *Ekonomicheskie problem razvitiya narodov Severa Rossii v perekhodny period* [The economic problems of the peoples of the North of Russia in the transition period]. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky: Kamchatka Printing House.
- Management Plan of Bystrinsky Nature Park (2003), Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky.
- Management Plan of Nalychevo Nature Park (2003), Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky.
- Fomenko G. et al. (2010), *Ekonomicheskaia otsenka osobo okhranjaemykh territorii Kamchatki: prakticheskie rezultaty i ikh znachenie dlja sokhraneniya bioraznoobrazija (na primere prorodnogo parka "Bystrinsky")* [Economic evaluation of Kamchatka specially protected natural territories: practical results and their importance for biodiversity conservation (by example of Natural Park "Bystrinsky")]. Yaroslavl: Kadastr Institute.
- Sharakhmatova V. (2003), *Traditsionnye znania korennykh narodov i ikh rol' v so-upravlenii prirodnyimi resursami* [The Traditional knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and its Role in Natural Resources co-management], in: Viter I. (ed.) *Veter vekov s parusakh Rossii (materialy ĎĐ Krasheninnikovskikh chtenii)* [Wind of Centuries in the Sails of Russia (Materials of the 20th Krasheninnikov's Hearing)]. Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky: Information publishing house center of Kamchatka Regional Library, p. 140-143.

Traditional Communities in World Heritage Properties: the Case of Ngorongoro (Tanzania)

Nicole Bolomey and Arpakwa M. Ole Sikorei

Introduction and background

The Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA) was created as a multiple land-use area in 1959, designated to promote the conservation of natural resources, safeguard the interests of the indigenous residents and promote tourism (Fig. 1). In 1979, the NCA was listed as a World Natural Heritage property under criteria (vii), (ix) and (x) for its stunning landscape, the quality of its habitats as part of the greater Serengeti ecosystems, the spectacular wildlife including the great migration of wildebeest, and the largest unbroken caldera in the world. The exceptionally long sequence of crucial evidence of human evolution led in 2010 to the site's re-nomination as a World Heritage mixed property (criterion iv). None of the values for which the site was listed, however, referred to the millennia-old interrelation between the indigenous pastoral and hunter-gatherer communities, the wildlife and the land.



Fig. 1: The Ngorongoro Conservation Area.

Map: <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/39bis.pdf>, p. 195 (Nomination File for Ngorongoro Conservation Area to be Submitted to UNESCO, p. 4)

Challenges

The NCA today is inhabited by an app. 87,000 indigenous people (Prime Ministers Office 2013), most of which are pastoralist Maasai, with a small minority of pastoralist Datoga and even smaller number of hunter-gatherer Hadzabe¹. The population over the past decades has been subject to very harsh living conditions leading to hunger, malnutrition, health problems, lack of jobs, absence of economic development, growing urban migration, and general disintegration of society. Benefit-sharing of soaring tourism

revenues (app. 30m USD in 2013) has remained marginal, and corruption hampered investments in development.

Many reasons for poverty and desperation lie in national and international governance and management systems. These include lack of sound participation in decision-making; limited access to services; remoteness combined with restrictions on movement (i.e. the NCA gate is closed between 6pm and 6am); resource competition with tourism (i.e. for water); dismissing traditional knowledge, and conservation-led restrictions of livestock mobility (a crucial element of sustainable pastoral land management and the well-being of livestock).

¹ This paper focuses on the Maasai majority as well as the Datoga community, both pastoralists with a similar social structure. The Hadzabe, suffering from different challenges, are not the focus of this short paper.

The Maasai however also see their lives impacted by a general decline of NCA's state of conservation, which they link to wrong² management practices, the construction of hotels and tourism services (i.e. in wildlife corridors, close to wells, etc.), and zoning of land, leading to overgrazing in some areas and overgrowth




Fig. 2: Community exercise during 2014 workshop assessing their happiness. Photo: Bolomey

(also impacting grazing of wildlife) in others³. Increasingly frequent droughts and growing demographic pressures add to a situation where in 2012 hunger and malnutrition allegedly led to the death of 200 children, and food aid had to be handed out in several subsequent years⁴.

Conservation paradigms

When Serengeti National Park was created in the 1950s, the prevalent nature conservation paradigm aimed to protect ecosystems *not materially altered by human exploitation and occupation* (IUCN 1970), without human presence apart from tourists and conservation professionals. For the Serengeti, this meant not only discarding the age-old systems of indigenous pastoral uses, but also removing the existing Maasai population – whose leaders finally agreed in December 1958 to relocate to the adjacent NCA. There, they were promised to be *permitted to continue to follow or modify their traditional way of life subject only to close control of hunting* (Government of Tanganyika 1958) in a site designated a *multiple land-use area* to promote the conservation of natural resources, safeguard the interests of the indigenous residents, and promote tourism.

This initial bias for the human inhabitants under the condition that they would not destroy forests and grazing land was however short-lived. The management plan of 1960, and more prominently the 1961 Arusha Manifesto by the first President of independent Tanganyika, Julius Nyerere, made clear that nature conservation actually had precedence. The Maasai population, within a year, *turned from legitimate residents with an expectation of assistance in return for their lost territories, into the "Maasai problem". The conservation of natural resources was no longer to be in favour of human use, but to be at odds with it* (Boerma 2014). (Fig. 3)

This conservation paradigm was still prevalent when the site became a natural World Heritage property in 1979. The recom-

mendations by the World Heritage Committee in the years following the nomination reinforced the views generally held in Tanzania that pastoral uses were incompatible with nature conservation; carrying capacities for people and livestock were long reached; growing cultivation was a great threat; and the Maasai should, in one way or the other, be led to leave the area. None of this was based on research of underlying causes, correlations and effects, nor was it a result of a sound participatory process with the communities, whose livelihoods entirely depended on natural resources. For decades, however, it cemented the trap in which the community was caught.



Fig. 3: Coexistence of wildlife and livestock.

Photo: Bolomey

In recent years, awareness for scientific evidence regarding the value of coexistence between pastoralism and ecosystem management in dryland ecosystems has been growing. The Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) to date remains committed to zoning and segregation as a main management approach, but under its new leadership since 2014, debate and change seem more possible than ever.⁵

Ngorongoro as World Heritage

The World Heritage Convention and its processes, over many years, were as much part of the problem as they also contributed to solutions. The top-down processes working exclusively through national governments also strengthen top-down mechanisms at national level. Reactive monitoring missions were often not apt to capture and help to resolve the complexity of the challenges; being too short, undertaken by experts specialized in ecosystems rather than people-wildlife coexistence, and hardly ever meeting the community⁶. UNESCO was perceived as unpredictable, immensely powerful, and unattainable. The introduction of 'communities' in

² Practices in contradiction to their traditional conservation understanding

³ All information from direct conversation during 16 different meetings / workshops held in 2013/14

⁴ Food has been handed out by NCAA and Central Government repeatedly in dry seasons since the ban on cultivation in 2008

⁵ Discussions during government workshop on 3-4 July 2014

⁶ Awareness of these flaws and UNESCO, the World Heritage Committee and its Advisory Bodies has in recent years led to steady improvements, but shortage of funds, political constraints, and the diversity of scientific paradigms still hamper the effectiveness of such missions.

the Operational Guidelines led to a better understanding of community issues, and indeed Committee decisions for NCA highlighting participatory approaches since 2009 slowly resulted in more realistic and solution-oriented Committee recommendations. The effect on the ground, however, remained marginal.

As UNESCO was hardly present on the site, it was also blamed for many unpopular decisions, some of which it had actually never taken. A good example was the cutting of scholarships for higher education⁷, which some were made to believe had come from UNESCO. No wonder the community welcomed the team starting in 2013 the dialogue process by saying: *We hate you: You are the cause of our suffering! And UNESCO must be God; as only God has the power to bring lasting suffering over its people*⁸.

National site management

NCAA, the national site manager, is a parastatal directly attached to the highest political levels. It was not set up, nor inclined, to integrate the indigenous population. Pastoralists in Tanzania are generally met with suspicion, seen as backward and obstinate. A warrior nation, they kept to themselves, maintained their social systems, traditional land management, and cultural traditions, and rejected national movements.

Over the past 55 years, some Conservators heading the NCAA introduced development schemes, funded education grants, and supported the formation of the Pastoralist Council, a political representation of the community established in 1990 (enacted in 2000). Pastoralism is however not a legitimate livelihood under the Tanzanian constitution. Thus any official development policy since 1961 worked in favour of settling, cultivating, and adhering to Tanzania's mainstream Swahili culture. The General Management Plan of 2006 and its 2010 revision therefore raised big hopes as it set the framework to *maintain a dynamic multiple land-use system, which perpetuates the historic balance of people and nature whilst at the same time to conserve the biodiversity and ecological integrity of the Serengeti ecosystem and Ngorongoro highland* (Ministry for Natural Resources and Tourism 2006). On the ground, until recently⁹, this translated to very little.

An interesting but also detrimental moment was the resubmission of the NCA for its cultural (paleontological) values in 2009/10: The nomination dossier also included the values relating to pastoralism and the Maasai coexistence with wildlife! But sadly, ICOMOS criticized not only the quality of the arguments made (which could be improved), but stated that *the Maasai are ... neither a unique nor an exceptional testimony to ... pastoralist traditions* (ICOMOS

Evaluation 2009). After almost 50 years of top-down initiatives to change the Maasai to become settled, educated, interested in wealth other than cattle, and longing for the bounties of the 20th century, ICOMOS argued that the distinctive pastoralism (in NCA) has now been significantly changed into agro-pastoralism... and that therefore ICOMOS does not consider that at the present time the conditions of integrity and authenticity have been met for the Maasai pastoral landscape (ibid.). And so, the Outstanding Universal Value continued to contradict the national multiple land-use policy as outlined in the NCA Act.

Where to go from here?

In 2013, UNESCO, together with the national government, started a process of dialogue between the communities, government authorities, scientific, economic and other key stakeholders. It went through a first phase welcomed intensely by the community, creating hope and a first level of trust. NCAA, with a new Conservator and a new Board, has made great efforts regarding its own



Fig. 4: Community meeting in Aleililei October 2013.

Photo: Bolomey

institutional change and the search for new approaches to the site's management – and may hopefully integrate UNESCO's lingering initiative in its effort for a holistic strategy for NCA 55 years after the creation of the NCA, trust is generally absent between all stakeholders. Building trust, however, needs time and patience. Painful topics will need to be addressed from corruption to population growth; paradigms will need to be discussed without prejudice; and stereotypes of 'the other' revised.

Governance is at the essence and needs to gain higher recognition by UNESCO, the World Heritage Centre, and their partners. They should understand their importance as potential mediator between conflicting stakeholders at World Heritage properties; especially where communities are weak. Participation and co-management cannot just be recommendations post nomination, but must be a condition sine-qua-non. Where governments lack participatory experiences, respect and understanding of traditional man-

⁷ Giving scholarships to the community of Ngorongoro was one of the most successful programmes by NCAA and the below mentioned Pastoralist Council, and continues up to secondary school levels til today

⁸ Personal experience

⁹ The lead author of the GMP recently became Conservator of NCAA.

agement systems, they need to be trained and assisted. Widely accepted crosscutting aspects such as culture, gender and human rights, do not end at World Heritage boundaries.

UNESCO, its UN and development partners need to be present on the ground to learn, support change, and feedback to further improve World Heritage systems and processes. Corruption



Fig. 5: Women and children walking for hours to gather herbs in Eastern Ngorongoro.

Photo: Bolomey

in World Heritage properties has to be addressed, and finally: Any site, cultural or natural, where there is a presence of indigenous peoples needs to be reassessed, redressing the balance of values and conservation approaches, traditional versus modern governance systems, and introducing adapted forms of joint site management. In the light of the most recent development to integrate indigenous peoples in the World Heritage Operational Guidelines, this is a logical and much-needed step to take.

References

- Boerma, David 2014: Comprehensive Desktop Review for UNESCO. Dar es Salaam (unpublished)
- Government of Tanganyika 1958, quoted in: Issa Shivji, Wilbert Kapinga 1997: Maasai Rights in Ngorongoro, p. 74
- ICOMOS Evaluation 2009, 39bis (all UNESCO-related documents on Ngorongoro can be found under <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/39/documents/>)
- IUCN 1970: Tenth General Assembly, New Delhi, December 1969, Vol. II. Proceedings and Summary of Business. Morges
- Ministry for Natural Resources and Tourism, United Republic of Tanzania 2006: Ngorongoro Conservation Area, Draft Management Plan, 2006 – 2016. Dar es Salaam
- Prime Ministers Office, Government of Tanzania 2013: Taarifa ya Tathmini ya watu na hali ya uchumi; Tarafa ya Ngorongoro Report. Dar es Salaam

Nature Conservation, Indigenous Land Rights, and UNESCO in the Kenya Lakes System

Wilson K. Kipkazi, Endorois Welfare Council (EWC)




Fig. 1: Lake Bogoria and its location in Kenya.
 Map: Dennis Milewa / Kenya Wildlife Service

In the 1970s, the Kenyan government evicted hundreds of Endorois families from their land around Lake Bogoria in the Rift Valley to create a game reserve for tourism (Fig. 1). This prevented us, the families, from practicing our pastoralist way of life, using ceremonial and religious sites, and accessing traditional medicines.

Our houses were burnt down, and the compensation we received was a meager 35 USD per household. While the reserve generates about 650,000 USD annually, we were promised other compensation and benefits, but they were never delivered, and our access to the land was left to the discretion of the Game Reserve Authority.

In 1995, the Endorois Welfare Council (EWC) was established in order to advocate our rights as a community. On behalf of the EWC, the Centre for Minority Rights Development (Kenya) and the Minority Rights Group International submitted a claim before the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR) after domestic legal efforts and action failed to constitute an effective remedy for the violations of our rights.

In a landmark judgment, the Commission confirmed in 2010 that the Endorois are the traditional owners of the Lake Bogoria area, and required the Government of Kenya to respect these ancestral rights. The Commission found that the Kenyan government had

the part of the civil society members involved in this case that its result would positively impact the negotiation process in favor of greater recognition of the economic, social and cultural rights of indigenous peoples.

This case marks the first time the Commission has recognized indigenous peoples' rights over traditionally owned land and their right to development under the African Charter. The decision is also noteworthy because the Commission emphasizes the African Charter's protection for collective claims to land rights by indigenous communities. It is also a relevant decision for economic, social and cultural rights advocates because the Commission stated that,



Fig. 2: A bird's eye view of flamingo on the coast of Lake Bogoria.

Photo: safaribookings.com

violated our rights to religious practice, to property, to culture, to the free disposition of natural resources, and to development under the African Charter (Articles 8, 14, 17, 21 and 22, respectively). The Commission stated that lack of consultation with our community, the subsequent restrictions on access to the land, and the inadequate involvement in the process of developing the region for use as a tourist game reserve had violated our rights under the U.N. Declaration on the Right to Development.

Also, the Commission found that the Kenyan Government's Trust Land System violated the Endorois' right to property. The system allowed gradual encroachment on our land, and even though it allowed for compensation, it nevertheless violated property rights by effectively causing forced evictions. For these violations, the Commission recommended that the government recognize our rights of ownership, to give restitution to us for our ancestral lands, to compensate our losses, and to ensure our benefit from the royalties and employment opportunities produced by the game reserve.

The Commission's decision was formally approved by the African Union at its January 2010 meeting. It calls upon the state of Kenya to report on the implementation of its recommendations within three months from the date of notification, and further recommends collaboration with the Endorois in implementing these remedies. Concurrent with this decision, Kenya was undergoing a process of constitutional review, and there was hope on

while the Kenyan Constitution guaranteed civil and political rights, it did not give an equivalent degree of constitutional protection to economic, social, cultural, or group rights and concluded that this denied the Endorois an opportunity to launch an effective claim on our ancestral land in the Kenyan High Court.




Fig. 3: Hot springs and geysers burst up from the ground on the shore of Lake Bogoria, attracting flamingos to the algae thriving in the waters.

Photo: thetreasureblog.wordpress.com

In 2011, the Endorois returned to their ancestral lands at Lake Bogoria (Fig. 4).

However, at the very same time that the Commission announced its decision, the Kenyan government nominated the Lake Bogoria National Reserve as a natural World Heritage Site within the



Fig. 4: Endorois people celebrate the return to their traditional lands in Lake Bogoria National Reserve in Kenya's Great Rift Valley, in May 2011.
Photo: Denis Huot/Alamy

"Kenya Lakes System", claiming that "the Government of Kenya wholly owns the Kenya Lakes System" (Republic of Kenya 2010, p. 86). Neither the nomination file nor IUCN Evaluation Report (IUCN 2010) mentions the rights, or even the mere existence, of the Endorois as an indigenous people in the area of the reserve even though the IUCN field evaluator spent several weeks in the region. In 2011 the Kenya Lakes System was inscribed by the World Heritage Committee as a natural site, despite direct objections raised by the Endorois in a number of international fora, including directly to the World Heritage Committee itself.

The case of the Endorois and the Kenya Lake System is of immediate interest as the new SOC for the site will be discussed in 39th Committee Meeting, and the Endorois in February 2015 have again communicated with the World Heritage Centre indicating concern about the effectiveness of the implementation of the Commission's prior ruling in favor of the Endorois.

The World Heritage Committee will consider a resolution reiterating its position urging the Government of Kenya to fully implement the Endorois ruling of the Commission. The case raises a variety of issues related to the rights of indigenous peoples living in natural sites, and the interaction of the World Heritage Convention with other forms of international law, in this case the African Charter, and would be a significant subject to be considered in the context of the role of civil society in the World Heritage Convention.



Fig. 5: A three-dimensional map, a result of a community mapping activity conducted for the management of the Lake Bogoria region.
Photo: Minority Rights Group

Subsequently in 2011, the African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights expressed deep concern that the inscription of the Kenya Lakes System, including Lake Bogoria National Reserve, was undertaken without the free, prior and informed consent of the Endorois and urged the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO and IUCN to review their procedures for evaluating World Heritage nominations and ensure that indigenous peoples are fully involved and their rights respected.

The World Heritage Centre and UNESCO responded to concerns raised after the inscription in 2014 in the State of Conservation Report (SOC) submitted to the World Heritage Committee (UNESCO 2014), and events in Kenya since the inscription - including the establishment of a new Management Committee for the site with participation by the EWC - appear to show that the interventions of UNESCO and IUCN through the SOC process have had some beneficial impacts to the ongoing struggle of the Endorois to exercise effective control over their ancestral lands (Fig. 5).

The original nomination of the Kenya Lakes System was (and continues to be) for natural values, raising issues around the appropriate way of acknowledging indigenous rights in conservation efforts aimed primarily at maintaining natural criteria. The

References

- IUCN 2010. World Heritage Nomination - IUCN Technical Evaluation. Kenya Lakes System in the Great Rift Valley (Kenya) - ID No. 1060 rev. http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/1060rev.pdf.
- Republic of Kenya 2010. Nomination Proposal. Kenya Lakes System in the Great Rift Valley (Elementaita, Nakuru and Bogoria). <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1060rev.pdf>.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2014. State of Conservation Report: Kenya Lakes System in the Great Rift Valley. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc/2895>.

NGO Cooperation with an Indigenous Nation for the Nomination of the Huichol Pilgrimage Routes, Mexico

Humberto Fernandez Borja, Conservación Humana

Mexico in the World Heritage

Mexico is one of five countries on the planet that are described as possessing biological mega-diversity. Additionally, it is one of the eight countries with major cultural diversity, as reflected in the 290 living languages that are still spoken by the native peoples, in addition to Spanish (De Ávila 2008). Together with the Fertile Crescent and China, Mexico is one of the original cradles of agriculture on earth. These are some of the characteristics that indicate the importance of Mexico in the global context and that, at first sight, seem to have a co-relation with the position of Mexico in World Heritage.



Fig. 1: The Huichols live in scattered and extremely remote villages in the Sierra Madre Occidental.

Photo: Humberto Fernández

Mexico ratified the World Heritage Convention in 1984, the first country in Latin America to do so. It has more sites inscribed on the World Heritage List than any other country in Latin America and is in seventh place internationally behind Italy, China, Spain, France, Germany and India. Today it has 33 sites: 27 cultural, five natural and one mixed. This wealth of WH sites occurs with imbalances, omissions and problems of representativeness, however, especially where Mexico's bio-cultural heritage is concerned. Practically, the initiative to nominate the 33 sites was decided by the government, and in more than one case the nomination was motivated

by political whims or to increase the touristic potential of a site. Indigenous peoples have not been involved in the nominations, and civil society has only been engaged in a few cases, basically to provide technical or financial support for the elaboration of some nomination files.

The disequilibrium in representativeness and the limited participation of civil society is also a characteristic of the Tentative List (24 sites registered). But one of them is a positive exception.

The Huichol Route through Sacred Sites to Huiricuta (Tatehuarí Huajuyé)

The route to Huiricuta is fundamental in the cosmogony of the Huichol Indigenous People. Its conservation is strategic for the survival of the native culture that has managed to preserve the vitality of its pre-Colombian roots as none other in North America.

The Huichol Route through Sacred Sites to Huiricuta is a bio-cultural corridor that contains ceremonial architectural complexes, significant agro-diversity, and the main sacred landscapes of the Huichol, as well as several priority regions for nature conservation in Mexico. It is located in the north of the country and it stretches from west to northeast along 500 kilometres. The corridor traverses the southern portion of three eco-regions of global importance for their contribution to biodiversity: the Gulf of California, the Western Sierra Madre and the Chihuahuan Desert (Fig. 1).

The Huichol culture is preserved thanks to the collective tenacity to perform their ancestral traditions. The agricultural, hunting and gathering practices are part of a ritual cycle, whose main purpose is to maintain positive relations with the ancestors and gods that control nature. Over 35,000 Huichol live in scattered villages, gathered in five tribes or communities that cover 400,000 hectares in the south of the Western Sierra Madre. However, their cultural geography is greater and goes beyond their communal territories to the sacred sites, to which they go following ancestral pilgrimage routes.




Fig. 2: The serial nomination to WH of "Sacred Landscapes along the Route to Huiricuta".
Map: Conservación Humana

All along the routes, deities are venerated that live in sacred natural sites, like rivers, springs, forests, hills or caves. When receiving offerings in the sacred sites, the deities grant the pilgrims with wisdom and spiritual guidance. The current pilgrimage routes of the Huichol are the most representative living testimony of exchange routes that connected and culturally enriched the peoples of the American continent for millennia.

The pilgrimages are also an educational experience and work as an "itinerant university". In each journey the elders convey to the young the most valuable knowledge of their ancestral legacy through chants, dances and sophisticated rituals. This way, the itinerary becomes the reading of an extended codex in the landscape. The oral transmission of knowledge along the routes is transcendental for the survival of the Huichol culture, since its language has no formal writing. (Fig. 2)

Initiative for the conservation of the bio-cultural corridor of sacred landscapes of the Huichol people

As a result of the Spanish conquest 500 years ago, the economical pillars of the indigenous peoples have been fragmented and their environment radically transformed. Regarding the Huichol, during the last decades, the "globalisation" and the policies to "de-indianize" of the Mexican state, executed together with a systematic violation of human rights, have accelerated the decay of its social

fabric. Which has not prevented the persistence of the Huichol spirituality, whose main support is its link with nature, that is clearly in great deterioration due to an absurd model of development.

Conservación Humana AC (CHAC) is an independent, non-profit Mexican organisation founded in 1995. By joint agreement, and together with the traditional Huichol authorities, CHAC has established an initiative to preserve the cultural and natural heritage present in the route and sanctuaries that will also encourage the sustainable development of the local inhabitants. To achieve this



Fig. 3: The elders and shamans lead the rituals and give the teachings during the sacred pilgrimage.
Photo: Totupica Candelario

goal, efforts are being made with other civil society organisations in Mexico and abroad, government institutions and international organisations. (Fig. 3)



Fig. 4: Offerings are made to the goddess of the Pacific Ocean, the final destination of the western pilgrimage route. Photo: Diana Hernández

The strategy of the initiative focuses on the promotion of environmental conservation tools, of land-use planning and on the protection of human rights, articulated with instruments of economical, social and cultural policies. The initiative relies on conceptual resources developed by the international community: the cultural landscapes, the sacred natural sites and cultural routes that unfortunately are not very well known in Mexico even to this day.

The Huichol and CHAC have worked together for 20 years in the characterization, geo-referencing and diagnosis of the Route to Huiricuta with the aim to provide it with the greatest recognition and legal protection, including its inscription to the World Heritage List as a strategic goal. The greatest difficulties have been: the discrimination of Mexican society towards indigenous peoples, their systems of knowledge, types of organisation and traditional practices; the absence of an adequate legal framework that guarantees their rights; the impunity and corruption in the enforcement of the current law, as well as ignorance and little regard of biodiversity; not to mention the levels of insecurity that rank Mexico among the most dangerous countries in America. Indeed this process has faced many struggles to avoid or reduce impacts to the sacred landscapes by highways, dams, mines, agro-industries and other “development” projects, usually poorly planned, that benefit only a few and that defies the applicable law.

Fortunately some goals have also been achieved among which stand out the creation of two ad-hoc natural protected areas: the State Park Huichol Route in Zacatecas and the Natural and Cultural Reserve of Huiricuta. Favourable legislative changes were introduced in the state of San Luis Potosí, establishing a legal precedent in culture and environmental laws of said state. In both laws the routes and the cultural landscapes, as well as sacred natural sites are recognized and protected for the first time in Mexico. Another noteworthy achievement was the inscription of the Huichol Route to the Mexican World Heritage tentative list.

Tentative List in 2004

In January 2015, CHAC and the Huichol finalized the elaboration of the Nomination File, incorporating heritage elements chosen by the *cahuiterus* (wise elders) and *maracate* (shamans). The site is presented as a serial nomination under the category of Associative Cultural Landscapes with the criteria iii, iv and vi. If this nomination is carried out, it would be the first nomination of a cultural landscape to the World Heritage List on the part of a living indigenous tradition in Latin America. It is important to highlight that in previous years we could count on the guidance and encouragement from the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO. And for the elaboration of the nomination file, we counted on the solidarity, support and counselling of the World Heritage Section of the National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH). This institution of the federal government endorsed the Nomination File and initiated the diplomatic protocol for its delivery to UNESCO headquarters, for its evaluation starting February this year. Unfortunately and surprisingly, the delivery of the nomination was detained by the intervention of other agencies of the Mexican government, with arguments that only benefit multinational corporations – mainly Canadian - that seek to develop large scale mining projects in some of the sacred landscapes.

Conclusions and recommendations

- Old structural problems prevent states from valuing and protecting their heritage in an integral manner, even more so in multicultural and underdeveloped countries, so that participation and the strengthening of capacities of the civil society is increasingly necessary.
- The criteria of Outstanding Universal Value of the Operational Guidelines must be adjusted to better cover bio-cultural heritage, especially agro-diversity.
- Clearer and more specific procedures for mixed sites nominations must be established in the Operational Guidelines
- The Universal Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples should be fully incorporated in the implementation of the Convention. The World Heritage Committee must require State Parties transparency in all the processes of the implementation of the Convention with regards to indigenous rights; including the process of nomination.
- Indigenous Peoples must be recognized as subjects of the law, and not only as participating actors; and mechanisms must be created to achieve their direct participation in the implementation of the Convention, with independence from the State Party.

References

- De Ávila, A. 2008. La diversidad lingüística y el conocimiento etnobiológico, en Capital natural de México, vol. I: Conocimiento actual de la biodiversidad. Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la Biodiversidad (CONABIO), México, pp. 497-556.



Participation of Civil Society in the World Heritage

Moderator: Stephan Doempke
(World Heritage Watch)w

Civil Society Participation in the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention: Challenges Ahead

Stephan Doempke, World Heritage Watch

In this paper, I will discuss the nomination, evaluation, monitoring and reporting of three World Heritage properties where I have worked. In the Simien Mountains National Park (NP) in Ethiopia, I was assigned a 3-month mission by UNESCO/IUCN to design a scheme to remove the population from the park. In the Sacred Mijikenda Kayas in Kenya, I evaluated the nomination on behalf of IUCN. In the town of Gjirokastra in Southern Albania, I worked for four years for local NGOs, supported by the German Society for International Cooperation (GIZ).

1. Simien Mountains National Park (Ethiopia)

Simien Mountains NP was inscribed in 1978, mainly for its spectacular landscape and in order to protect two species of global importance: the Walia Ibex (*Capra walie*) and the Simen Fox (*Canis simensis*). The park was inscribed as a natural site (under categories vii and x) with full knowledge that it has been inhabited by human populations for centuries, and that in fact it is a massively overused cultural landscape (Fig. 1).



Fig. 1: Village of Gich, Simien Mountains NP, with loss of vegetation cover due to heavy overgrazing. Photo: Stephan Doempke

Since the Walia Ibex is threatened by poaching and the Simen fox by reduction of its habitat through the conversion of grasslands into pastures and farmlands, the misguided inscription of the NP led to the exclusive focus of saving endangered wildlife.

Furthermore, the human population was automatically considered a factor of disturbance, rendering them antagonists to the wildlife management of the park. This was aggravated by the fact that the park's population is a Muslim enclave within a Christian majority population.

In 1996, the park was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Since then, ever new requirements were imposed on the State Party, including extensions of the park. In an extremely remote region of one of the poorest countries in the world, and with minimal capacities for park management, these measures were implemented with little practical effect.

Failing to take the full context of the park into view, which includes a population with a food shortage and without any access to resources whatsoever (i.e. funds, education, markets, experts) to improve their situation, UNESCO and IUCN conceived a solution to the problem by reducing agriculture and grazing activities of people already living on the very margins of existence. Even their removal from the park was considered a possibility - a scenario amounting to a violation of human rights, whose chief stalwart is UNESCO, and in a country notorious for its policy of forced relocation of entire villages (Fig. 2).



Fig. 2: Inhabitants of Gich, Simien Mountains NP. Photo: Stephan Doempke

Instead of putting pressure on the park inhabitants, I drafted an \$8.7 million scheme by which the entire park population could be offered new jobs outside the park through an economic develop-

ment program and thus solve the problems of both nature conservation and the welfare of the people. Until today, the funds for this scheme have not been raised in a country which receives more development aid per capita than most others in the world.

2. The Sacred Mijikenda Kayas (Kenya)

The *kayas* (sacred forests) of the Mijikenda people are the last remaining islands of primary forest in the coastal hills of Kenya. They are impenetrable thickets with clearings in their centre. In these clearings, the sacred objects of the tribe are being kept, and ceremonies and gatherings of traditional authorities are held (Fig. 3).



Fig. 3: View of Kaya Kauma. The sharp boundary between the densely forested kaya and the agricultural land outside is clearly visible.

Photo: Stephan Doempke

Because of their both natural and cultural value, the *kayas* were nominated as a serial mixed property comprised of 36 individual sites extending over roughly 200km along the entire coast of Kenya (Fig. 4).

A common IUCN/ICOMOS mission of only two experts had five days for the evaluation of the nomination. The mission schedule, which had been fixed by the State Party before my arrival, did not include any open time to accommodate unexpected matters. Only 12 *kayas* could be inspected, all in the southern part of the country, and the maximum time available for each was two hours. An assessment of the integrity of the natural values of the property was impossible beyond a first-glance impression.

A State Party representative was present at all times, and actually served as interpreter as well, making it impossible to assess the correctness of the interpretation and to obtain any statement from anyone in a free and open setting. This is of particular concern to the opinions of local communities and their relationships to administrative and governmental bodies. Furthermore, key issues such as adopting adequate legal and administrative frameworks for the safeguarding of the nominated property, foreseeable implementation on the ground, management and enforcement capacities, and the acknowledgement of traditional institutions and rights could




Fig. 4: The Mijikenda tribes and their kayas, southeastern Kenya.

Map: E. Shephard-Walwyn: Culture and Conservation in the Sacred Sites of Coastal Kenya. University of Kent 2014

not be checked. It remained unclear whether the local population was fully aware of the implications of a World Heritage status. All this put the reliability of the evaluation into serious doubt (Fig. 5).



Fig. 5: Evaluation of community involvement during a meeting of the Elders Council of Rabai village.

Photo: Stephan Doempke

3. The Historic City of Gjirokastra (Albania)

Gjirokastra is a small historic town in Southern Albania exhibiting a typical Ottoman town plan and a unique architecture of its approximately 600 residential mansions. The town suffers from a general lack of management, inadequacy of law and lack of enforcement, neglect and decay of historic buildings due to emigration, and an uncontrolled boom of inadequate new constructions (Fig. 6).



Fig. 6: View of Palorto Quarter, Gjirokastra. The Ottoman character of this residential area has almost been lost due to new constructions, red tile roofing and modern additions.

Photo: Stephan Doempke

The World Heritage nomination has been a project by the political and intellectual elite of the country, with strong ties to Gjirokastra. Inscription was politically motivated to a high degree after considerable lobbying of World Heritage Committee members by the State Party. At the time of inscription, large parts of the town, including its historic bazaar centre, were in a dramatically dilapidated condition. Any serious evaluation of the property would have revealed its massive social, economic, and political problems and lack of management capacities. A recommendation for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger seemed certain and should have been carried out.

The nomination file is sloppy and incoherent. The map indicating the houses belonging to the 1st category of monuments is faulty in several cases, and the houses are represented by idealized drawings from 1961 rather than by photos showing their present - and alarming - condition. This could not have escaped the attention of the ICOMOS evaluator (Fig. 7).

The remaining local inhabitants (about 70% of the historic town stands empty) take pride in the fact that their town is a World Heritage site, but have no idea why. They have never been informed about questions such as what is UNESCO, where are the boundaries of the property, who is in charge of safeguarding their town, whether their house is a cultural monument, and that a World Heritage property can be deleted from the World Heritage list.

The relevant legal-administrative framework is inadequate, and local capacities, both in terms of human and financial resources, are entirely insufficient for managing the town's historic values.




Fig. 7: Representation of the Galanxhi House in the nomination file (above) and present condition (right). Drawing from <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/569rev.pdf>.

Photo: Stephan Doempke

Additionally, by mid-2014, none of the municipality staff spoke English.

The national ICOMOS committee is composed of experts from state institutions, leading to conflicts of interest since they cannot uphold independent opinions. Gjirokastra has no urban plan, no management plan, no tourism plan, no conservation plan, no design guidelines, and next to no operational budget. A master plan funded by the World Bank excluded the historic part of the town. Rampant illegal construction was not stopped until 2014.

Ownership of historic houses is often unclear when owners are not registered, making any decision about some houses impossible. There are no guidelines and no trained craftsmen for restoration and modernization of buildings according to conservation standards. The government, on the other hand, has no rights to intervene in private real estate property.

After repeated failure by the State Party to comply with World Heritage Committee requests, and after alarming reports by local NGOs, an ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission visited Gjirokastra in November 2012. The mission, consisting of one professor for architecture who was unfamiliar with Gjirokastra, visited the town for one day which she spent in meetings and an extended lunch. The State Party actively tried to prevent her from contacting NGOs. As a result, she did not see the town by daylight, and her report contained serious errors and mistaken assessments, which had to be corrected by local NGOs after they managed to get hold of her mission report through informal channels (Fig. 8).



Fig. 8: While the ICOMOS Mission Report states, “A substantial financing of 85.000.000 lekë has also been allocated for the reconstruction of roads in the historic centre”, these funds have actually been used to cover historic cobblestone pavements with concrete. Photo: Stephan Doempke

Additionally, the Periodic Report of 2014 - which was compiled without knowledge of civil society - contained misleading and false information, as exemplified in Figure 9. While the State Party rated most visitor facilities as “Adequate”, in actuality, one of the facilities does not even exist.

Again, only local NGOs would have been able to provide independent information correcting this report. The report, which the World Heritage Committee accepts as correct from its advisory bodies, became the basis for its Decision 39 COM 7B.75.

Fig. 9: 4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

		Actual Condition
Visitor centre	Adequate	<i>does not exist</i>
Site museum	Adequate	<i>opening only upon request</i>
Information booths	Adequate	<i>very little materials available</i>
Guided tours	Adequate	<i>cannot be booked locally</i>
Trails / routes	Adequate	<i>no marked routes exist</i>
Information materials	Adequate	<i>official materials are unavailable</i>
Transportation facilities	Poor	
Other	Not needed	<i>no evening entertainment available</i>

From the 2014 Periodic Report of the State Party, p. 9. <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/periodicreporting/EUR/cycle02/section2/groupb/569.pdf>. Notes in italics were added by the author.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Local communities and civil society organizations are not sufficiently involved, and their legitimate concerns not sufficiently considered, if at all, in the nomination, evaluation, management monitoring and reporting of World Heritage Properties. As a result, the World Heritage Committee and Advisory Bodies do not have adequate information and cannot take appropriate decisions for the safeguarding of World Heritage Properties.

Not only the conserved properties themselves, but their socio-economic environment and dynamics as well must be considered in nominations, evaluation, management, monitoring and reporting in order to assess risks and threats. Much more time, experts from various fields, and the compulsory involvement of civil society are required to do that, including the fully-informed and free prior consent of the latter in any decision affecting their lives.

The Potential Roles of Civil Society Within UNESCO's World Heritage Regime – an Analysis from a Multi-level Perspective

Thomas Schmitt, University of Augsburg / Erlangen

Anyone with some knowledge of how the UNESCO World Heritage system works will be able to recall episodes that show the (generally positive) role played by civil society in the preservation of UNESCO World Heritage properties. This paper offers a systematic overview of the potential roles of civil society stakeholders in the World Heritage system. The analysis is based on a multi-level approach, which is organised through the agencies of "global", "national" and "regional/local" social actors, stakeholders, institutions and organisations (Schmitt 2011; Schmitt 2015). The framework is sketched out in Fig. 1. Following an explanation of the approach, possible roles for civil society stakeholders are discussed.

through practices and discourses. The power relations between social actors and institutions within the World Heritage system, and therefore between different scales, may change over time. Ideally, there is constant communication between the different levels, with information flowing in both directions. In addition, each institution may exercise influence on the others. In many cases, however, different languages are spoken on the different levels, and the actors live in different socio-cultural milieus. There may also be different understandings and readings of the World Heritage Convention on the three levels. According to the world society approach developed by John Meyer (2005), global institutions prescribe not only the contents but also the forms of such communication.




Fig. 1: A multilevel perspective on the World Heritage system (translated from Schmitt 2011, 423)

The main social actors within the global level of the World Heritage system are the UNESCO World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies. On the local/regional level we think of the site manager, but also, for example, the mayor, investors or local NGOs. In terms of social constructionism, such levels of authority are not ontological entities, but are continually being reconstructed

should take into account the recommendations made by the advisory bodies in respect of nomination dossiers or the resolution of problems at World Heritage sites (Schmitt 2011). In recent years, however, many observers and actors have noted a silent departure from this unwritten rule by the States Parties delegates, who have become more and more uninhibited in asserting what they believe

For many decades, the global level of the World Heritage system was characterised by a soft system of "checks and balances" between the World Heritage Committee on the one side, and the UNESCO administration and scientific advisory bodies on the other. Unlike the separation of powers in a nation state, this system was based on a kind of voluntary self-restriction on the part of the World Heritage Committee as sovereign ruler over the World Heritage List. For instance, there was an unwritten rule that the Committee

to be their own interests, with a kind of self-serving mentality (see Brumann 2011).¹


One task for civil society stakeholders on the global level of the World Heritage system would be to help to bring about a rebalancing of the relations between the Committee and the Advisory Bodies. In addition, civil society organisations could play a role in making concerns and voices heard on the global level which are not shared, or are not sufficiently shared, by the World Heritage Committee, the Advisory Bodies and the UNESCO administration. Former blind spots in the World Heritage system have been identified by important actors within the system, such as the insufficient inclusion of indigenous groups or minority groups at World Heritage sites. Such groups are now recognised in principle by the global institutions, but their interests are often disregarded in discussions on concrete sites, so that there is an urgent need here for corrective action by civil society.

In the multi-level World Heritage system, the intermediary national level has a pivotal function; actors at this level not only inform the global institutions of problems at World Heritage sites, but also let the local institutions know about the opinions and expectations of the World Heritage Committee. However, it can happen that the national level acts as a filter and a blockage; from a normative point of view, important information is not transported adequately through the bottleneck of the national level in both directions (top-down and bottom-up). Such malfunctioning on the part of the intermediary level may be due to (a) capacity problems in the national institutions, (b) their ignorance of local problems, or (c)

deliberate political decisions and external strategies on the part of national actors who do not want to see such problems discussed on an international level or who even encourage and support what the World Heritage regime must regard as negative developments at World Heritage sites for the sake of their own economic or political interests.

In such situations, civil society can at least attempt to play a corrective role by transporting information about the problems from the local level to the global level of the World Heritage system, by-passing the national institutions. Thus, civil society constitutes a third channel for the flow of information between scales, in addition to the national institutions and the communication paths and networks within the Advisory Bodies. The potential unreliability of reports by the Advisory Bodies on the basis of brief visits to World Heritage sites is vividly described by Stephan Dömpke's contribution in this volume (on the problem of presenting the local perspective at the global level; cf. Schmitt 2009 and Schmitt 2011).

In terms of the multi-level approach, civil society organisations must discursively transport problems at World Heritage sites to the global level of the World Heritage system. Albeit, in order to accomplish this, locally and globally acting NGOs need access to the global institutions, and in particular to the World Heritage Committee and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Ideally, (local and global) civil society organisations and the global institutions of World Heritage governance are natural collaborative partners for the protection of World Heritage sites as desired by the Convention.



T. Schmitt

As a rule, lines of conflict within the World Heritage system do not occur along scalar lines of separation; rather, they often run across the global institutions, as can be shown by the example of the conflict over the Cologne Cathedral (Fig. 2). In 2004, the Cologne Cathedral was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger because the Committee thought that the “visual integrity” of the cathedral was endangered by high-rise building projects in the city of Cologne. This danger was first

Fig. 2: The conflict of the World Heritage status of Cologne Cathedral in Germany (2004-2006) – conflict lines and scales
The bottom right photo shows the conservationist, Ms. Precht von Taboritzki, with some of the author's students; in the bottom centre image is Ms. Barbara Schock-Werner, who was master builder of the cathedral at that time. The centre left image shows the German delegation at the 2006 meeting of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee.

¹ It is possible that this trend was halted, at least for the time being, at the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee held in Bonn in 2015.

recognised not by the responsible local authorities, but by a conservationist (who was not the appointed representative in this case), Ms. B. Precht von Traboritzki, who succeeded in gaining the support of the German Commission for UNESCO, ICOMOS Germany, and finally the UNESCO administration and the World Heritage Committee. Her objections were initially dismissed as irrelevant by the Cologne urban community and local politicians. Only following an intervention by UNESCO – whose competence was initially denied by local politicians (see Schmitt/Schweitzer 2007) – did her objection gain weight which could no longer be ignored. National actors and the master builder of the Cologne Cathedral, who were anxious that the cathedral should not lose its World Heritage status, adopted a mediator position in the conflict.

This case shows that adequate protection of World Heritage sites requires collaboration between civil society actors and UNESCO. Civil society organisations can play an important role by drawing attention within local/regional societies to the goals of the World Heritage Committee, raising awareness in respect of problems, and fighting for adequate protection – for implementing protective measures always lies in the hands of the local and national actors.

Another weakness of the World Heritage system may be mentioned here: the mandate of the World Heritage Committee is limited to those sites which have been inscribed on the List with the consensus of (and which are normally nominated by) the State Party in which the site is located. Degradation and devastation at sites to which an outstanding universal value could easily be ascribed, but which have not been nominated for the List, fall outside the competence and powers of the Committee and of UNESCO in general.

This applies, for instance, to the old town of Kashgar, which is situated on the historic silk road, in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region in northwestern China. The layout of the old town of Kashgar followed typical principles of Islamic urbanism. In 2009, the Chinese authorities, under the pretence of building earthquake-proof structures, started an urban development programme under which the greater part of the old town is currently being demolished (Gesellschaft für Bedrohte Völker 2009). Neither

the World Heritage Committee nor UNESCO as a whole have, until now, intervened to prevent the destruction of this cultural heritage of humanity. The case of Kashgar, and the general practice of non-intervention with regard to endangered sites which are not inscribed on the World Heritage List, may be seen as a weakness of the World Heritage regime (Schmitt 2015). A further, indispensable duty of civil society organisations would be to address such problems within the global arenas of World Heritage and to move UNESCO to condemn such developments by adopting adequate resolutions.

Civil society represents a potentially important corrective factor in the face of official political structures, whether in local urban communities or on the level of global institutions, such as UNESCO. Despite legitimate rejoicing that civil society has become stronger in the context of the World Heritage system, all those involved – including the members of civil society themselves – must not forget that the positions of civil society stakeholders are not, as a rule, democratically legitimated, and are not automatically “better” in either an ethical or a scientific sense, than the positions of established institutions. Rather, they are under a permanent obligation to demonstrate this through their everyday activities.

References

- Brumann, C. (2011): Unser aller Kulturgut: Eine ethnologische Annäherung an das UNESCO-Welterbe. *Sociologus* 61, 19-44.
- Gesellschaft für bedrohte Völker (2009): Rettet Kashgar! Report der Gesellschaft für bedrohte Völker – Juli 2009, Göttingen.
- Meyer, J. W. (2005): *Weltkultur: Wie die westlichen Prinzipien die Welt durchdringen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Schmitt, T. (2009): Global Cultural Governance: Decision making about World Heritage between politics and sciences. *Erdkunde* 63, 103-121. DOI: 10.3112/erdkunde.2009.02.01
- Schmitt, T. (2011): Cultural Governance: Zur Kulturgeographie des UNESCO-Welterberegimes. *Erdkundliches Wissen* 149. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Schmitt, T. (2015): UNESCO as a Red Cross or as a notary of World Heritage? Structures, scale-related interactions and effects of UNESCO's World Heritage regime. (= MMG Working Paper 15-05 & ISSN 2192-2357) Göttingen.
- Schmitt, T. and Schweitzer, A. (2007): Welterbe oder Stadtentwicklung in Gefahr? Zu deutschen Debatten und zur global-lokalen Governanz von UNESCO-Welterbestätten am Beispiel des Kölner Doms. *Berichte zur deutschen Landeskunde* 81 (4), 329–352.

Sacred Natural Sites, Indigenous Peoples' Rights and Bio-Cultural Approaches to Nature Conservation¹

Robert Rode, Brandenburg University of Technology (BTU)

The expanded discourse of sacred natural sites (SNS) has transformed the relationship between conservation practitioners and indigenous communities, which is characterized by an internal social structure of world society. As a sociological approach to globalization phenomena, world society theory seeks to explain the contingency of local problematic circumstances under global conditionality (Wobbe, 2000, p. 16). By employing world society theory, which considers the reorganization of global order since 1945 as a point of departure regarding the scope of normative expectations and references, this paper investigates the idea that SNS represent a distinctive field of social interaction facilitating cooperation at different geographical scales (local, regional, etc.), coupled with interaction opportunities for conservation practitioners and indigenous peoples.¹

Sustainable development, as a specific notion of development, has been connected with the transformation of global order, and represents a manifest field of the study of world society. This paper stresses that the United Nations (UN) as well as its specialized agencies, such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), have provided the information and data for the formulation of world societal problems in relation to sustainable development by transforming the relevance and expectations of nature conservation.

¹ In the field of sociology authors have also criticized the notion of "world society" because they question whether the entire world may constitute a "society" in terms of identity, shared norms and values, a coherent political governance framework comparable to a nation-state, and congruence of general living conditions. However, in her recent study of world society as a scientific discourse the Austrian sociologist Veronika Wittmann (2014) stresses that sociology possibly holds to a notion of "society" that can no longer be maintained. Most "national" societies bear much resemblance to what many sociologists might understand as a more or less congruent or homogeneous society. Against this backdrop Wittmann considers world society as an approach to reflect on global transformations, which transcend societal boundaries confined by the nation-state. In this regard, she suggests six characteristics of world society: (i) socio-economic inhomogeneity; (ii) global processes of sociability (in German "Vergesellschaftung"); (iii) dynamic cultural particularities that are simply part of world society; (iv) global norms and processes of regulation beyond national legislation; (v) transnational identities; and (vi) integration into global structures through a plethora of organizational forms (ibid., pp. 51–5). The world society discourse, therefore, seeks to trace global consequences in local events and the complexity of social interactions as a globalised context. Although this paper does not discuss the entire debate on world society it is important to understand at this point that as a scientific discourse it stresses integrative moments in an era of globalization despite continuous incongruence, inhomogeneity, instability or uncertainty in social relations and interactions.

In the process of expanding the designation archetype of protected natural areas worldwide, the question of sustainable development has come to the fore, particularly with more reliable data available concerning environmental degradation and the resulting loss of biodiversity. Because of their high levels of biodiversity, SNS have drawn attention from the environmental protection movement. In its specific SNS conservation guidelines the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) argues that "in many societies, traditional sacred natural sites fulfil similar functions as legal protected areas" (IUCN, 2008, p. 5).

Commonly, the use of these sites has been restricted in history as a result of their specific cultural or spiritual significance to certain communities. According to IUCN, even if human influence is greater at some SNS, they often continue to retain high levels of a variety of animal and plant species. It is however impossible to reach agreement on the significance of the sacredness of spaces, particularly because the meaning of the term "sacred" has been challenged due to a rejection of the literal truth of specific belief systems. In cultural anthropology, for example, differences in nomadic and sedentary understandings of sacred spaces have been discussed in various cultural contexts, and thus show the central importance of the interaction between physical and spiritual life for nomadic people (Vitebisky, 2005).

This paper cannot, however, venture into the broad debate on the significance of sacredness, yet it acknowledges that SNS reflect a spiritual and cultural relationship between certain communities' faith with natural sites. The understandings of these complex relationships are often shared by local communities – but also by entire communities of faith – and it is therefore difficult to define them unambiguously.

SNS – and in particular indigenous peoples' SNS – are deemed important reservoirs of biodiversity by various international bodies and organizations. An assortment of international organizations concerned with nature conservation and sustainable development have come to the conclusion that the ecological diversity in these reservoirs may be a direct or indirect result of customary management practices. In 1999, a comprehensive study by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) established a framework

for understanding the importance of biodiversity for indigenous communities. In their contribution to the report, Andrew Gray and other experts on the subject highlighted that the fundamental relationship between biodiversity and indigenous communities lies in local knowledge or a “traditional ecological knowledge of indigenous and tribal peoples” (1999, p. 73). For conserving biodiversity, as the UNEP report adds, the uniqueness of traditional indigenous knowledge is critical, because here the term “traditional” does not refer to the relics of an individual community’s past but rather seeks to draw attention to the ways these practices are acquired and used by those communities in their environment and territories (ibid., p. 75).

An important feature of the conservation practices at indigenous peoples’ SNS is a specific group of people who have watched over them for a very long period of time. This group is often described as “custodians” of the spiritual and biological values of SNS, and international bodies such as IUCN have adopted this notion in their guidelines for identifying the relevant stakeholders for the conservation of such sites. In terms of a civil society perspective, nature conservation strategies need to carefully embrace indigenous SNS custodians. The overarching framework for furthering these strategies is provided through the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

Through the adoption of the UNDRIP by the General Assembly of the UN in September 2007, a process of intensive negotiations between human rights experts and advocates, indigenous peoples’ representatives, and member states’ representatives was concluded after almost 25 years. The adoption of this Declaration reflects growing global normative ambitions by giving indigenous issues more relevance within the overarching framework of the UN human rights agenda, and by altering the political process in this field through communication.

In order to acknowledge the importance of ethnic, religious, and cultural identifications of norms and the impact of the constantly growing number of civil society organisations in this field, academic scholarship in social sciences accepts the notion that normative ambitions also govern global politics. The emergence of the global indigenous movement and, more specifically, the process of the composition of the UNDRIP exemplifies how networks of non-state-actors increasingly influence the evolution of international human rights instruments and, more broadly, the role of norms and identity in international and transnational patterns of interaction and political communication. Rhiannon Morgan argues that through the increased availability of new information and communication technologies globalisation has created networking opportunities for indigenous peoples worldwide, and these new opportunities of exchanging information and views have facilitated, to a large extent, the emergence of a global indigenous movement (Morgan, 2011, p. 63).

Morgan also highlights the role of this new transnational social movement with regards to the shifting global attention to new

articulations of the human rights discourse. Hence, the transformation of global institutions and international law also point to processes in which heterogeneous indigenous communities and nations bring their concerns to the fore. Indigenous SNS are in this regard heritage sites that embody the complexity of those transformations, and where bio-cultural approaches to nature conservation alter the dominant global models of sustainable development.

Conclusion

In sum, these considerations show how indigenous peoples, nature conservation practitioners, policy-makers and researchers seek to merge the concern with SNS with the discourse on sustainable development. It is precisely the contingent history of the term itself that has allowed these different sectors to formulate normative ambitions and expectations globally, which seek to transform the understanding of nature conservation.

In the context of the UN, sustainable development as a new ideal of development may appear to be imposed from above on other geographical and political scales. However, it is the ambiguous use of the term that also creates openness and inclusiveness, and its meaning no longer exclusively refers to the environmental, social and economic dimensions of development. The global concern with SNS and the attempts to establish a framework for bio-cultural approaches to conservation indicate a broader scope of global cooperation in nature conservation, and where conflicts, opposition, and competing interests reflect the increased authority of the cultural dimension in this field.

References

- Barthel-Bouchier, D. 2013. *Cultural Heritage and the Challenge of Sustainability*. Walnut Creek, Calif., Left Coast Press.
- Gray, A. et al. 1999. Indigenous Peoples, their Environments and Territories. In: *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity. A complementary contribution to the Global Biodiversity Assessment*. Nairobi, United Nations Environment Programme, pp. 59–118.
- IUCN, 2008. *Sacred Natural Sites. Guidelines for Protected Area Managers*. http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/pa_guidelines_016_sacred_natural_sites.pdf (Accessed 1 September 2014.)
- Morgan, R. 2011. *Transforming law and institution: indigenous peoples, the United Nations and human rights*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- UN. 2007. *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. New York, United Nations. http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf (Accessed 1 September 2014.)
- UNESCO. 2013. *The Hangzhou Declaration. Placing Culture at the Heart of Sustainable Development Policies*. <http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/images/FinalHangzhouDeclaration20130517.pdf> (Accessed 1 September 2014.)
- Vitebisky, P. 2005. *Reindeer People: Living with Animals and Spirits in Siberia*. London, Harper Perennial.
- Wittmann, V. 2014. *Weltgesellschaft. Rekonstruktion eines wissenschaftlichen Diskurses*. Baden Baden, Germany, Nomos.
- Wobbe, T. 2000. *Weltgesellschaft*. Bielefeld, Germany, Transcript.

The Second International Conference on Best Practices in World Heritage: People and Communities

Prof. Dr. Alicia Castillo, Complutense University of Madrid (UCM)

on behalf of the Coordination Team: M.A. Querol, Isabel Salto-Weis, Jaime Almansa, Simón Gornes, Joana Goal and Cristóbal Marqués

Currently, there are more than 1000 sites on the UNESCO World Heritage List, where Spain has one of the largest numbers of World Heritage properties (44), following only Italy and China. As can be imagined, appropriate management of all these sites faces multiple challenges.

Within this context, a research team at the Complutense University of Madrid (UCM) led to the investigation of the management of World Heritage sites, and the notion to promote international debate around it (www.parquecipamu.es). As a traditionally rich island that celebrates cultural and scientific events, Menorca has become the meeting point and the ideal place to hold conferences on this topic.

The International Conferences on the island of Menorca started in 2012. The objects of debate and reflection cover a variety of aspects, such as why a specific place has become part of this privileged list, the measures taken by the governments and managers in dealing with these places, and how all of this affects communities living nearby.¹ The conferences were able to be carried out thanks to the sponsorship of the Island Council and the support of other entities. This council has also presented the “Talayotic Menorca”, currently on the Tentative World Heritage list², which is one of the reasons for their support. The second conference was devoted to a topic that is one of utmost importance and one that should be the base of undertaking such nominations: People and Communities.

Who owns the past? What makes us protect or preserve one part over another? What do we feel when visiting a monument? How does one’s perception of a monument change whether you belong to that place or just visit it? What happens within a city

whose inhabitants receive millions of visitors every year? How do indigenous communities adapt to patrimonialization of their past? How can we balance the relevance of expert knowledge and traditional knowledge? Cultural heritage encompasses many people, but what is the role of the citizens in its management? Do we really need expert people to manage our past, or should it be the exclusive responsibility of citizens since it is inherited by them? Should they decide what must be kept? In the event of war or conflict, why are the material remains of our ancestors or things belonging to what we consider ‘our history’ destroyed?

These questions, and many others, are faced by those who work with cultural heritage assets. For World Heritage sites, solutions to these problems are even more demanding and important because they are assets whose values go beyond borders. In other words, it has been realized that the values at these places are not just important for those living near them, but also for visitors and the rest of the world. These sites that are considered important for all of humanity are recognized and listed by the 191 state parties that have ratified the UNESCO World Heritage Convention. UNESCO is an intergovernmental organization, a branch of the UN, and it is experiencing a crisis of its operational capability and its deployment of democratic functions. These limitations are partly a result of its high level of bureaucratization and gap between its institutional representatives and civil society. World Heritage and the list, which are firstly managed by the World Heritage Center, are an example, among many others, of the necessity to review and reflect upon the intention of all these legal and administrative international mechanisms to manage values and properties. Additionally, we need to reflect upon its impacts on the benefits of education, culture and science – the reasons justifying the essence of this organization.

The Menorca Conferences are aimed at becoming spaces for facilitating all kinds of voices to be heard: UNESCO, its partners, its advisory bodies, and World Heritage managers, but also more

1 http://www.congresopatrimoniomundialmenorca.cime.es/WebEditor/Pagines/file/Libro_Ponencias.pdf

2 <http://www.menorcatalayotica.info/portal.aspx?IDIOMA=3>

external voices, voices which are not often heard or are not officially backed by the World Heritage Center.

Additionally, this conference has tried to experiment with new ways of action which will give more relevance to collective work through reflective exercises. As well as this, the topic of this conference, people and communities, has encouraged local participation and several events and meetings. More than 800 inhabitants of Menorca participated in these meetings and proposed activities related to the island's cultural heritage and its nomination for World Heritage (Fig. 1).

us collect news from all over the world about World Heritage and they dealt with the conferences' social media. In the same vein, we counted on and appreciated the cooperation of Paisaje Transversal,⁴ a company which enlivened the event and encouraged the attendees to participate.



Fig. 2: People reading the notes about the topics of the conference. These notes were made before the last participatory session with the objective of developing the Best Practices document. Photo: A. Pastor



Fig. 1: Example of the impact in the media of participatory processes developed on the island four months prior to the conference. More than 800 inhabitants visited and participated in the activities developed in the tents which were up for two days in the squares of the most important cities on the island.

Source: Diario de Menorca, 1 February 2015.

In the elitist and traditional media of cultural heritage studies, we are trying to discover new opportunities which allow and encourage the entrance of new points of view. In order to create this renovation, the collaboration of young companies has proven to be essential. Social media, in the hands of JAS Arqueología³, has catalysed this initiative by moving the virtual public, which emerged months before the event itself. This audience is still growing both on Facebook and Twitter, constituting one of the biggest virtual communities of World Heritage conferences up to now. The support of UCM students, about twenty people studying archaeology and/or history, has been crucial. They helped

They get them to have a voice. The attendees could put their ideas down in small notes which became the basis for a document which gathered Best Practice examples in World Heritage (Fig. 2). As mentioned previously, the topic was "People and Communities", and the document is still under construction. We used several mixed participatory methodologies to get the collective thoughts which were written down by small groups consisting of both students and experts.

There are four main points which describe what happened at the conference, which can be found below.

TOPICS: Cooperation, stakeholders, economic boosters, perception and interpretation, conflict resolution and social implication, and transversal actions.

WHO: From people constituting our committees (organizing, honorary, scientific and advisory committee) to participants from the five continents. Additionally, a thousand people brought their experiences and assessments to the congress. We like to highlight that students at Spanish universities (in Barcelona, Seville, Granada and Madrid) and European universities (Germany, France and England among others) made up 20% of the total attendees (Fig. 3). We received around 200 proposals from over 40 countries. Finally, the works were selected by the scientific committee and people from 22 countries as diverse as New Caledonia, Costa Rica, and Ethiopia. Everything is available on our website.⁵

We were very strict with the selection of papers, but it is important to highlight that it was very difficult to control the quality of

3 <http://www.jasarqueologia.es/>

4 <http://en.paisajetransversal.com/>

5 <http://congresobuenaspracticasm.blogspot.com.es/2015/05/videos-twitter-buenaspracticasm.html>



Fig. 3: Participants of the conference.

Photo: A. Pastor

papers at this kind of event. The best ones were more descriptive or denounced conflictive situations. The papers concerning more sustainable models of working with communities were less numerous. This goes to show that there is still a need for improving the role of civil society at World Heritage sites.

HOW: Through several sessions, short communications and round tables (Fig. 4). We highlighted topics such as the consideration of cultural heritage as a path towards the achievement of peace, tourism and sustainable development by the inhabitants of these places, the need for new discourses or ways of understanding what must be preserved, the relevance of pedagogy to understand and respect cultural heritage, the emergency of breaking through the barriers between expert discourse and that of citizens, etc. Moreover, we arranged our social media so that some questions could be put forward as well as allowing spaces for positive and negative opinions, and to point out ideas about communities' relationship to World Heritage or the lack of it. Finally, we highlighted the participatory action of the last day when we reflected upon prepared topics related to the notes from the previous days.

WHAT do we want to achieve? To improve practices and put forward new strategies for the management of World Heritage sites.



Fig. 4: Groups of participants discussed the topics during the last session of the Conference about the Best Practices document.

Photo: A. Pastor

We elaborated a collective document which included the proposals gathered during the congress, publicly released through our social media and open for public comment.

As a sample, a summary with the lists of topics and best practices is provided (see below). The full text can be consulted in the Proceedings of the conference (Castillo ed. 2015: Best Practices in World Heritage: People and Communities; in preparation).

Topics:

1. Involvement of communities
2. Underlying principles in Cultural Heritage
3. Conflicts: geopolitics and daily conflicts
4. Pedagogy
5. Tourism
7. Channels of communication

Best Practices:

- Developing a new World Heritage discourse from the basis of society
- Developing mechanisms ensuring communication among the relevant stakeholders
- Identification of community representatives at the World Heritage site
- Creation and use of international non-governmental organizations to mediate in wars or in terrorism situations in their different forms
- Training communities in educational values and forms of communication regarding World Heritage
- Organization of mediators in daily conflicts
- Development of educational measures and strategies for inhabitants and visitors at World Heritage sites
- Changes in the tourist experience according to citizens' appropriation of the generated benefit
- The use of Information and Communication Technologies

In summary, it is highly recommended to hold conferences about Best Practices in World Heritage and, this time, to reopen and renovate the debate surrounding World Heritage and its relationship to society.

A Network of Local Communities and World Heritage in Colombia

Marcela Jaramillo Contreras

The concept of world heritage was initially based on European stereotypes and studied exclusively by renowned architects and planners. However, in the last decade the international community has realized the importance of going beyond the euro-centric views, expanded the academic and social spectrum, endorsed the importance of interdisciplinary methods and encouraged the inclusion of local communities in the patrimonial processes. Subsequent to the 1972 Convention, decisive roles of communities in the World Heritage processes have been proclaimed by documents like the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 1999), the report of the General Assembly related to cultural heritage as a human right (United Nations 2011) and the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee on the fifth 'C' (Community) as a strategic objective (UNESCO 2007). But the question remains: Have the member countries and international organizations such as UNESCO, ICCROM, IUCN and ICOMOS advanced the process with these intentions? Are local communities truly taken into account in the process of nominating, reporting, monitoring, etc., of World Heritage sites?

The system of participation of civil society in Latin America, especially in my home country of Colombia, has been well

recognized worldwide. After the 1991 constitution, the voice of local communities became a structural axis of any public process. With regard to heritage, the national legal system provides various mechanisms for democratic participation, which allow the involvement of communities in the judicial, administrative, political, planning and management of heritage sites, and to protect the collective right to defend their cultural heritage. In addition, some programs have been developed in order to allow the

participation of civil society such as the System of Cultural Heritage at the national, regional and district levels, the Training Workshops, the Binnacle of Cultural Heritage (based on the UNESCO education kit "World Heritage in Young Hands") and especially the *Vigias del Patrimonio Cultural* ("Guardians of Cultural Heritage"), which focuses on engaging local communities with their cultural heritage.

This program, based on the system of Red Cross volunteers, was introduced 15 years ago with the support of the Ministry of Culture and seeks to integrate local communities across the country inter-



Fig. 1: Organizational Chart of the Vigias del Patrimonio Cultural.

Source: Ministry of Culture of Colombia, Directorate of Cultural Heritage

ested in promoting, protecting and researching the historical memory of their territories. Currently there are 2695 vigias of cultural heritage in 28 regions of Colombia (out of a total of 33), which are organized in groups of local communities that defend their assets against any risk, and at the same time develop a project related to a) knowledge and assessment of cultural heritage, b) training and dissemination of cultural heritage, and c) conservation, protection, recovery and sustainability of heritage. The Network is divided into seven nodes, where each node is comprised of several departments (Colombian regions), and these in turn are comprised of several groups of vigias (Fig. 1).



When a group manifests its intentions to be part of this network, they must fill in a form after their revision by the Ministry of Culture and under the *vigia* oath. Next, the insignias of the program (vest and cap) are given, and then the group has the duty to protect and defend its cultural heritage (Fig. 2). Also, they are able to take part in the National *Vigias* Meetings, regional meetings, trainings and contests (awards for the best projects). Through this network, which has been attempted to be replicated by other countries in Latin America, citizens have been able to express their right to be informed, to give their opinion and to participate actively and directly in actions around their heritage.



Fig. 2: Vigias from Cañasgordas.

On the other hand, based on the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (UNESCO 2013a), I would like to offer some recommendations and discrepancies concerning the role of communities with the World Heritage:

- The decisions issued by the World Heritage Committee and the reactive monitoring processes are largely based on the assessments of qualified experts (UNESCO 2013a Art. 23). These experts, probably belonging to ICCROM, IUCN and ICOMOS, make a technical assessment based on thematic and comparative studies (ibid. Annex 3.III). Unfortunately in this framework, the opinions of the communities who live daily with the world heritage are not taken into account. Consequently, it seems that the fifth C (Communities) as a strategic objective of the World Heritage Convention is being omitted.

- The World Heritage Committee must be consistent with its intention to involve local communities with the World Heritage; nevertheless, the Rules of Procedure of the Committee do not allow the

For example, in the city of Gigante in the region of Huila, the group of *vigias* collected the oral tradition of the city accounted by elders (Fig. 3), or, the group of children *vigias* in the city of Cartagena



Fig. 3: The group of Guardians of Gigante, Huila.

Source: Ministry of Culture of Colombia, Directorate of Cultural Heritage

entry of people outside of those who work with heritage (UNESCO 2013b). Would it not be essential that the opinion of a local community representative be listened to during the nomination processes, if they are well understood as the persons who are coexisting daily with the world heritage which is nominated?

- Management Plans should be planned in an appropriate participatory manner in order to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value of the property (UNESCO 2013a, Art. 108), however it is not specified nor are details given about the strategies involving local communities in the management plans, for example through consultation processes or pedagogical methodologies.

- In the limited literature concerning the relationship between communities and world heritage, the involvement of the community could be understood by experts to be of utilitarian manner, which means that local communities are normally understood as the main actors for heritage protection. However, international organizations do not treat as equally important how local communities assess their own heritage. Generally, experts travel to the site to conduct an assessment without asking the local community about their perceptions. Experts should include in such assessments those perceptions in order to formulate the nomination dossiers. Although the Operational Guidelines men-

tell the visitors the history of the historical center of the city. In this way, there are more than 280 groups that work to promote the cultural heritage of their regions.

tion the involvement of communities in the nomination process, the description is weak and poorly detailed (ibid., Art. 120-128). Are the World Heritage assessments prepared only according to the perceptions of experts? The registration process of any property must be public and it should include consultative processes in order that the property assessment be the most impartial and inclusive as possible.

- In the procedure to nominate a property for the World Heritage List (ibid., Art. 123), States Parties should be requested to explain in detail how they have involved the local communities in the identification of the property; likewise, in the form for the Periodic Report (ibid., Art. 206), States Parties should be requested to describe in detail how the community is being included in the process of management and protection of property.

Finally, I point out how the role of communities could be strengthened in the framework of the World Heritage Convention through a network, based on the experience of *Vigias del Patrimonio Cultural* of Colombia, and thus address some of the weaknesses in the proceedings of the Convention.

Through this network:

- The local communities can be part of any process of cultural heritage, not only for the management and protection, but also in the process of assessment and identification of the properties. The inclusion of local communities in all processes of heritage increases the sustainability of the property.
- The rights of communities – indigenous, African descent, gypsies, peasants, women, children, etc. – to access and enjoy the cultural heritage can be realized (United Nations 2011).

- A small amount of money could be set up through the *World Heritage Fund* which could finance projects submitted by local communities and encourage communities to protect their heritage and to be a part of the network.
- The network could be coordinated through a central agency such as UNESCO or World Heritage Watch, through the regional support of the national offices of UNESCO's, national ICOMOS chapters, or a Category II Center of UNESCO, and could also get the support of the countries under the representatives of the member country's entities such as their Ministry of Culture.
- The economic costs are not anticipated to be very significant. Good software, an administrator and the support of the international agencies to spread the information of the program globally would be sufficient.
- Finally, the need to involve communities with their cultural heritage is mentioned throughout the Operational Guidelines. However, this responsibility is delegated mainly to the States Parties (UNESCO 2013a, Art. 12). Why could the international community not assume a network which encourages countries to include communities around the World Heritage process?

References

- Australia ICOMOS Inc. 1999: The Burra Charter. The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance. Burwood.
- UNESCO 2007: Decision WHC 31 COM 13A
- UNESCO 2013a: Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (Decision 37 COM 12II)
- UNESCO 2013b: Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World's Natural and Cultural Heritage. Rules of Procedure (WHC-2013/5)
- United Nations 2011: General Assembly A/HRC/17/38, 21 March

V. Resolutions



WORLD HERITAGE WATCH

International Conference “The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society”

Bonn, Germany, 26-27 June, 2015

Final Document

I.

The UNESCO World Heritage Convention (“Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage”) is one of the most effective global mechanisms for the protection of natural and cultural heritage, and an overwhelming success story. It has been ratified by 191 countries and achieved near-universal validity. To this day, 1007 properties have been included in the World Heritage List.

Many of the properties now under protection would not have been preserved had they not been inscribed, monitored and supported by UNESCO and its Advisory Bodies. Often the international attention and enormous prestige associated with the World Heritage status have been critical in saving properties from the forces of destruction and ignorance.

And yet, in spite of all efforts and successes, the World Heritage is exposed to ever new threats. Economically weaker countries in particular do not have the capacity to grant the conservation of their World Heritage properties the priority which is needed in order to ensure their protection. With decreasing financial resources and mounting challenges affecting a steadily growing number of World Heritage properties, the needs for monitoring, preserving, safeguarding, supporting and protecting the properties at times exceed the capacities of States Parties, and increasingly even those of UNESCO.

Natural heritage properties are particularly affected by factors such as climate change and related extreme weather occurrences, resource extraction, poaching and development. Cultural properties and landscapes suffer from construction, modernization pressure, neglect and mismanagement, but increasingly also from warfare and willful destruction. Much less noted, but equally harmful for both natural and cultural heritage, are environmental damages caused by everyday human activities such as air pollution from traffic, heating and factories, the spreading of alien species, changes in both natural and man-made water systems, use of pesticides and household chemicals, excessive human visitation, and accumulation of waste.

II.

UNESCO has emphasized in many documents that the World Heritage can be protected in the long term only with the involvement of local communities:

The *World Heritage Convention* itself specifies in Article 5 that “each State Party [to this Convention] shall endeavour (a) to adopt a general policy which aims to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community...”

The “*New Directives Concerning UNESCO’s Partnership with Non-Governmental Organizations*”, numerous other UNESCO and World Heritage policy documents of the World Heritage Committee express the need that “relevant communities be actively involved in the identification, management and conservation of all World Heritage sites”.

In its *Budapest Declaration*, the World Heritage Committee has identified five key strategic directions (the so-called 5 Cs), among them to

- increase public awareness, involvement and support for the World Heritage through **C**ommunication, and
- enhance the role of **C**ommunities in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

The Strategic Action Plan for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention 2012–2022 states that it is important to ensure that local, national and international communities feel a connection to, are engaged with, and benefit from the world’s cultural and natural heritage. The plan emphasizes a need for greater dialogue on tentative lists, the preparation of nominations, evaluation processes and inscriptions as well as conservation and monitoring.

The *Final Report on the 40th Anniversary of the World Heritage Convention*, “The Kyoto Vision: A Call for Action”, recommends strengthening relationships with communities in order to integrate cultural, social, economic and environmental considerations with a perspective of sustainable development and benefit-sharing for the local population, without which it would be difficult to ensure the outstanding universal values of the World Heritage.

III.

World Heritage Watch has been established as a non-governmental organization in order to build a global network of Civil Society Actors (CSAs)¹ and Indigenous Peoples who support the protection and expansion of the network of World Heritage sites, and to better bring their concerns to the attention of the World Heritage Committee and its Advisory Bodies, States Parties and the general public.

At the invitation of World Heritage Watch, 125 representatives of non-governmental organizations, local communities, indigenous peoples, concerned individuals, academic experts, students and international organizations, from 34 countries and all continents, came together at the International Conference “The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society” on 26-27 June 2015 in Bonn, Germany. We discussed and formulated our views on how civil society actors and indigenous peoples can best participate in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, and how the World Heritage could best benefit from the involvement and contribution of civil society and indigenous peoples.

As a result of our deliberations, we have compiled our findings in the 12 points below, which will guide our strategic work on World Heritage in the future.

1. Civil Society and the World Heritage Committee

We believe it is vital, consistent with the practices and policies of the United Nations, and in the interest of an effective implementation of the World Heritage Convention, to build systematic links between CSAs and World Heritage, for collaboration to enhance the role of CSAs in the work of the Convention. Joining forces wherever possible is necessary in order to maximize effects in the safeguarding of World Heritage. Working actively in the field, CSAs are involved in the investing of hundreds of millions of dollars each year for the conservation and protection of individual World Heritage properties.

We call upon the Statutory Bodies of the World Heritage Convention to show support and recognition of CSAs by urging States Parties to grant increased consideration and appreciation of the civil society sector.

It is essential for building future cooperation that the World Heritage Committee express acknowledgment of the role Civil Society Actors play in the implementation of the Convention, and to establish a formal process of dialogue between the World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies and CSAs ensuring the effective inclusion of CSAs in the procedures, processes and structures of the World Heritage Convention.

2. International Civil Society Network

An open list of CSAs with relevant knowledge, expertise, or particular interest related to World Heritage properties should be established. This list may help the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO in identifying and contacting relevant CSAs.

¹ **Civil Society Actors (CSAs)** are understood here to include non-governmental organizations, individuals, informal groups and local communities who are not part, and do not act on behalf, of state institutions. **Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)** are those CSAs which have formalized structures. These would include non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other non-profit bodies who are unrelated to governments. **Indigenous peoples** are rights-holders with internationally recognized rights beyond those of civil society.

CSAs with expertise in the conservation and management of, or advocacy for, World Heritage properties should be accorded Permanent Observer status to attend and engage at the sessions of the World Heritage Committee, and that such status be made automatic for NGOs with General or Special Consultative Status with ECOSOC. We recommend that CSAs be able to participate actively in the sessions of the World Heritage Committee.

3. Credibility - Transparency and Access to Information

In order for civil society to play its role in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention as well as in the conservation and management of World Heritage properties, it needs access to all relevant information. A more open communication between the Statutory Bodies on the one hand and Civil Society Actors on the other, with accessibility of information, would be beneficial to achieving the aims of the Convention.

Recalling the Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, which has become a standard-setting instrument for the right to official information, we request that the World Heritage Committee and UNESCO urgently establish the necessary procedures to align transparency and accountability in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, including in the identification, monitoring and management of World Heritage properties and in the processing of World Heritage nominations. Such procedures should include, inter alia, the principle that Tentative Lists, World Heritage nomination files, strategy and planning documents, evaluation and mission reports should be made publicly available in full as soon as they have been accepted by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre or Advisory Bodies.

We ask the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to adhere to principles and best practices of openness, transparency and civic participation in all administrative planning, and emphasize that the most effective measures for participation can be taken when there is early access to information on real and potential projects affecting World Heritage properties and those having potential for World Heritage listing.

4. Tentative Lists and Nomination Procedures

More encouragement should be given to implement the upstream processes in the preparation for both World Heritage Tentative Lists and nominations. It is essential that the opinion of local populations be actively engaged during these processes, acknowledging the fact that they are the people who coexist daily with the World Heritage property. In general, a proactive and preventive approach should be taken in safeguarding all natural and cultural heritage and especially those properties envisaged for inscription so that local and indigenous communities and governments are prepared for managing, monitoring and preserving the property after inscription. Essential standards of conservation, management, human and financial resources, equipment, and public participation must be achieved and demonstrated before a property can be inscribed in the World Heritage List.

For the successful conservation, management and sustainable development of World Heritage properties it is essential to understand the rights, needs, values and aspirations of communities that would be affected by an inscription. As part of the nomination process, local communities and other CSAs should be fully informed, in a timely fashion, and consulted about the implications of World Heritage status, and the free, prior and informed consent should be obtained from indigenous peoples, before further pursuing the nomination. No property should be inscribed against the stated will of a majority local population.

Effective consultation and participation of local communities and indigenous peoples during the preparation of World Heritage nominations should be ensured through a wide range of extensive participatory processes and tools, as a means to collectively define the complex system of values that will need to be protected over time, and to create a commitment for a common vision both for heritage preservation and sustainable development. In this context, the intangible values related to the tangible ones, as perceived by the local community, should be fully considered in nominations.

5. Environment and Sustainable Development

As human impact on natural systems and cycles increases, both natural and cultural heritage and cultural landscapes come under growing pressure from environmental factors. To better understand, mitigate and reduce human-induced environmental threats to cultural and natural heritage is a mounting challenge. Realizing sustainable lifestyles is becoming of critical importance in this context, and this will not be achieved without active involvement of local communities and indigenous peoples.

We therefore welcome the UN 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the UNESCO Sustainable Development Strategy for the World Heritage Convention, and we applaud UNESCO's determined efforts to include the conservation of the world's natural and cultural heritage in the SDGs. While there can be no sustainable development without the conservation of natural and cultural heritage, there cannot be a successful conservation of natural and cultural heritage outside a general context of sustainable development either.

The SDGs' call to strengthen efforts to protect the world's natural and cultural heritage opens a great opportunity to integrate the preservation of cultural and natural heritage in national and international sustainable development policies and programs.

We support sustainable development efforts that benefit local communities, highlighting traditional resource use and local creative industries. All efforts should be made to ensure that World Heritage properties will not be harmed by development projects, taking the precautionary principle fully into account. Many of our organizations have extensive on-the-ground experience in integrating sustainable development and conservation, and we are fully convinced that such strategies will benefit from a systematic consultation with, and full participation of, civil society and indigenous peoples. In this context, traditional materials and small-scale technologies and systems must be investigated, refined and applied with priority. We look forward to working with the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO, the Advisory Bodies and States Parties towards this end.

Full socio-economic and ethnographic studies should precede all World Heritage nominations in order to recognize the living dynamics in heritage sites, and the multiple layers and identities, the views and nature of all affected communities, ensuring that there is a balance of interests. Moreover, populations near heritage sites are frequently vulnerable, and it is vital to recognize and care for the socio-economic situation of already disenfranchised people.

We call upon all relevant donors to include the sustainable development of the socio-economic environment of World Heritage properties in their agendas, and to give them highest priority in the implementation of their development programmes. Safeguarding World Heritage properties through conservation measures alone, in isolation from their spatial, socio-cultural and economic context, has meant a continuing struggle with local communities and a permanent financial burden on public budgets. It leads to an alienation of people from their heritage, and is eventually bound to fail.

Instead, Culture in general and World Heritage in particular must be considered nuclei and motors of sustainable development from which local communities rightfully expect to derive an economic benefit. Especially in remote and economically disadvantaged regions, their importance for regional development can hardly be overestimated. They create jobs far beyond conservation: in land use, tourism, administration, monitoring, education, architecture and construction, PR and IT, culture and entertainment, arts and crafts, and technical professions of all kind. A thriving socio-economic development around World Heritage properties will raise the funds required for their conservation, relieve public budgets, and will therefore be the best guarantee for their continuing protection.

6. Evaluation, Monitoring and Reporting

We greatly appreciate the work of the Advisory Bodies on the evaluation, monitoring and reporting of the World Heritage properties, in spite of significant budgetary constraints. We fully support the role of the Advisory Bodies to provide science-based expertise as the principal basis for the decision-making by the Committee.

Partly due to this lack of funding, many of the Advisory Bodies' evaluation and monitoring missions are too short, and carried out by experts insufficient in numbers to inspect the properties, meet with officials and civil society, carry out surveys, study documents, and check all information to the extent necessary in order to be able to provide a comprehensive and fully reliable assessment of all aspects of the property's condition. In particular, the lack of time does not allow for the recognition of ongoing hidden dynamics which would reveal a deeper understanding of potential and subliminal threats to the property, and allow preventive action to be taken before situations culminate in crisis.

It should also be ensured that every mission have access to experts on legal-administrative framework and management, and that evaluations not only check documents but more importantly compare them with existing capacities and actual implementation. Gaps between objectives and actions of management plans and reality need to be addressed more consistently and more frequently. There is an important role for civil society to help achieve balanced evaluations based on long-term observation, and to assess the incremental benefits of World Heritage status compared to other protected heritage sites.

In summary, all evaluation, reporting and monitoring missions should include extensive communication with civil society, and that all CSAs and indigenous peoples have sufficient and independent access to missions. Civil Society Actors should have the opportunity to comment on all reports and draft decisions before they are adopted, as well as submitting independent opinions, and such comments and reports should be made available to all those who receive the official reports and draft decisions.

7. Management and Management Plans

Management plans or mechanisms are key tools for the successful safeguarding of World Heritage properties. There is an urgent need to build the capacity of site management staff as a vital tool to improve the management of World Heritage properties, as well as that

of local communities in order to ensure their effective grass-roots participation. We look forward to working in the future with the World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies and States Parties to support programmes such as the Africa Nature Programme, the capacity-building programme for natural sites in Africa, and comparable programmes for cultural heritage.

Management Plans or mechanisms should be developed in a fully participatory manner through consultation processes, workshops or pedagogical methodologies, based on clear and detailed requirements and standards.

There are convincing examples that local communities can play a positive role in the management of properties, e.g. by providing expertise, forming volunteer groups, citizen research, act as heritage guardians and promoters, organize events, raise funds, and much more. We invite the World Heritage Committee and States Parties to explore the benefits of such co-management approaches, to encourage the forming of citizen initiatives in this field, and to support them in every possible way. Management Plans should also be made available to the public in order to allow learning from best practices.

8. Communication – Information and Awareness-raising

More often than not, local populations and administrations have little knowledge why their heritage site is on the World Heritage List, who is responsible for its funding, conservation and management, and what the restrictions are that inevitably come with World Heritage status. This is equally true for natural and cultural properties, and for developed and developing countries.

In order to enable civil society to participate effectively in the identification, nomination, conservation and management of World Heritage properties, there is a need to raise awareness of the values involved, and to improve knowledge about both the World Heritage regime of governance in general and the World Heritage properties in particular.

Information and awareness-raising are continuing tasks, and require the establishment of permanent contact points as well as measures which effectively reach out to the people concerned. Such campaigns should be applied also during the nomination procedures as part of increasing “preparedness” of local communities as indicated in Article 111 of the Operational Guidelines. They should include information about, and discussion of, inter alia,

- the nature and importance of the World Heritage Convention as an instrument of international and national law;
- the difference between World Heritage properties and other protective instruments in terms of conservation requirements;
- key terms such as “Outstanding Universal Value”, “integrity” and “authenticity”;
- providing clear and understandable definitions and cultural taxonomy to allow for a better transfer of knowledge;
- descriptions of responsibilities and authorities of all institutions involved, and of all relevant procedures in management, monitoring and reporting, so as to explain to civil society actors their options for getting involved.

9. Governance of the World Heritage Convention

The World Heritage Committee

The overall impression of the work of the World Heritage Convention and the World Heritage Committee is its slow pace of action, and an attitude of reactivity rather than proactivity. In too many cases intervention comes too late to prevent serious adverse impacts on World Heritage properties.

We request the World Heritage Committee to pay greater attention to early signs of risks and threats, especially when indicated by civil society, to take more preventive action, to make its recommendations and decisions more precise and coherent, to be more determined and rigorous when following up on the implementation of its recommendations and decisions, and to link its work with States Parties with the basic human right to the enjoyment of culture and heritage and a healthy natural environment. Further clarification and increased binding force are needed for the implementation of Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines.

In order to facilitate the implementation of both the World Heritage Convention and the Decisions of the World Heritage Committee, we encourage the Committee to request States Parties to adopt certain international standards and documents upon which the work of the Convention is built explicitly or implicitly, for example the concepts of “cultural landscape” and “historic urban landscape”, the Valetta Principles and the Faro Convention.

The Advisory Bodies

We encourage the Advisory Bodies to better connect with the work of civil society organizations. In order to operate in a transparent and credible fashion as an impartial and independent body, we recommend that only experts who are not staff of state institutions be allowed to work on behalf of an Advisory Body in World Heritage matters.

Funding

We are deeply concerned about the lack of funding of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies. A sharply reduced staff and operational budget must deal with a steadily growing number of World Heritage properties and challenges of hitherto unseen dimensions, resulting in an unsustainable situation and putting the World Heritage at great risk. The World Heritage Centre can no longer meet its tasks without professional staff specialized in all fields of culture and nature - and, in addition, human rights, social sciences and administration.

We call upon UNESCO, the World Heritage Committee and States Parties to make more determined efforts to expand the budgetary funds for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

10. The List of World Heritage in Danger

Inscription on the List of Sites in Danger is not perceived in the same way by all States Parties or by Civil Society. Some countries apply for, or willingly accept the inscription of a site to focus international attention on its problems and to obtain expert assistance in solving them - and gain important international recognition when those properties are removed from the list. Others wish to avoid such a designation.

The List of World Heritage in Danger is an important and useful mechanism to draw national and international attention to management deficiencies or external pressures likely to affect the long-term integrity and authenticity of properties that have been accorded World Heritage status. For multiple reasons, however, insufficient action is being taken to remove many World Heritage properties from the Danger List, some of which have been languishing there for 10 years or more. One of the unfortunate results of that inaction is a weakening of the Convention.

Several of our organizations have prioritized efforts to help secure the removal of targeted sites from the List of World Heritage in Danger. We look forward to continuing to provide targeted States Parties with technical guidance and support in the preparation of the Desired State of Conservation for Removal (DSOCR) framework, and by helping to ensure that Parties can implement a set of required and necessary corrective measures. We are keen to coordinate with UNESCO, the Advisory Bodies and the relevant State Parties to mobilize the funds necessary for such work, and we call upon international donors to make the removal of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger a priority of their agenda.

11. The Global Strategy

We consider the Global Strategy for a Balanced World Heritage to be of tremendous relevance for the credibility of the Convention, and therefore for the World Heritage as a whole. We deplore that since its inception in 1994, no significant progress towards the goal of the Strategy can be seen, urge the World Heritage Committee to take much stronger measures towards its achievement, and declare that we are ready to work with the Committee for their adoption and implementation.

Nature conservation organizations have already been actively engaged with priority-setting processes and efforts, globally, regionally, and at the national level. At the global level, several of us have engaged in such processes through IUCN (e.g., Key Biodiversity Areas, Species Survival Commission, and World Commission on Protected Areas), the Convention on Biological Diversity, and other fora and organizations. We stand ready to provide input to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, IUCN, ICOMOS and governments, including technical support to State Parties in reviewing their tentative lists and in the possible preparation of nominations (as many of us have already done in many cases).

12. Indigenous Peoples

Recognizing the special position of indigenous peoples in both legal and practical respects, we request the World Heritage Committee to ensure that all procedures under the Convention fully respect the rights of indigenous peoples, and endorse the Call to Action of the International Expert Workshop on the World Heritage Convention and Indigenous Peoples (Copenhagen 2012). Many of the recommendations made in this document are of relevance to indigenous peoples and non-indigenous communities alike. We would like to highlight the following recommendations:

1. That the World Heritage Committee urgently establish an open and transparent process, with the direct, full and effective participation of indigenous peoples, to elaborate changes to the current procedures and Operational Guidelines, and other appropriate measures to ensure that the implementation of the World Heritage Convention is consistent with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and a human rights-based approach. Such changes should affirm and guarantee, among other points, the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples, prior to any tentative listing or inscription of a World Heritage site incorporating or affecting their lands, territories or resources; and the recognition of indigenous peoples as rights-holders and not merely stakeholders;
2. That the World Heritage Committee establish, with the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples, a public list of those sites on the States Parties Tentative Lists and on the World Heritage List which may affect the rights, lands, territories or resources of indigenous peoples;
3. That States Parties, UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee provide sufficient financial and other resources to effectively support and advance the full realization of the rights of indigenous peoples in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and the measures outlined in the Call for Action, and of the provisions of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in all matters concerning the World Heritage Convention;
4. That the World Heritage Committee establish, with the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and through an open and transparent process, an advisory mechanism consisting of indigenous experts, to assist in the implementation of measures to ensure that all actions related to the World Heritage Convention uphold the rights of Indigenous peoples;
5. That the World Heritage Committee issue a standing invitation, and provide support to the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues to participate in, and effectively contribute to its sessions;
6. That States Parties and the World Heritage Committee urgently respond to and redress conditions within existing World Heritage sites where human rights violations or conflicts continue to affect indigenous peoples;
7. That the World Heritage Committee request the Advisory Bodies to include experts on indigenous peoples' rights on their World Heritage Panels and as desk reviewers of all nominations affecting indigenous peoples;
8. That States Parties ensure the equitable and effective participation of indigenous peoples in the management of World Heritage sites within indigenous peoples' lands and territories, and support indigenous peoples' own initiatives to develop administration and management systems;
9. That States Parties ensure that the benefits arising from the designation of indigenous peoples' lands, territories and resources as World Heritage sites are defined by, and genuinely accrue to the indigenous peoples concerned, in a fair and equitable manner.

Bonn, 27 June 2015



Civil Society Statement I to the 39th Session of the World Heritage Committee

On Civil Society Participation

Civil Society Organizations having attended the conference “The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society” organized by World Heritage Watch on the 26-27th June 2015 appreciate the opportunity to address the 39th Session of the World Heritage Committee, and thank the Government of Germany for graciously hosting us.

We will circulate a document on the outcomes of the conference, which will call for a series of actions relating to both cultural and natural World Heritage. We would like to take this opportunity to bring to the Committee’s attention a key point of consensus requiring urgent action.

We are committed to the World Heritage Convention as the global framework to identify and safeguard our planet’s unique cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value for future generations. The Convention protects the world’s most iconic and best known sites to the general public for the benefit of all people of this world. Thousands of individuals, local communities, NGOs and other Civil Society Organizations as well as indigenous peoples work on a daily basis, as professionals or volunteers, to identify and promote, conserve and restore these properties. We raise hundreds of millions of dollars each year for individual WH sites, and support national governments to fulfil their obligations under the Convention. This opens a way to a mutually beneficial relationship which we seek to develop further.

We are committed to working together to strengthen our engagement with the members of the WH Committee, States Parties, the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and to addressing the lack of systematic and structured dialogue and involvement with the bodies of the Convention, in particular the WH Committee. We welcome the discussion on this issue initiated by the Director General of UNESCO as reflected in the document “The World Heritage Convention: Thinking Ahead” (WHC-15/39.COM/5C). It is time for the Committee to give civil society a formal role in the processes of the Convention, in a spirit of open dialogue and cooperation, thus fostering our mutually beneficial relationship.

We therefore ask the WH Committee to recognize the contribution of civil society organizations to the good governance of the Convention and to welcome the initiative taken by civil society to hold a Civil Society Conference prior to the annual session of the WH Committee and present their results to the Committee Meetings. We urge the WH Committee to explore, through the WH Centre, with Civil Society Organisations opportunities for strengthening civil society participation in the implementation of the Convention, for consideration at the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2016.

As Civil Society Organizations working in support of both cultural and natural World Heritage, we stand ready to support the Secretariat, States Parties, Advisory Bodies and the Committee in this process.

Berlin, 27 June 2015



WORLD HERITAGE WATCH

Civil Society Statement II to the 39th Session of the World Heritage Committee

On Indigenous Peoples

Civil Society Organizations having attended the conference “The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society” organized by the World Heritage Watch on the 26 – 27th June 2015 appreciate the opportunity to address the 39th Session of the World Heritage Committee under agenda point 11 of the Operational Guidelines. In the aforementioned conference, we have also considered various impacts of the World Heritage Convention sites on indigenous peoples and local communities.

Many world heritage sites have been, or are owned and managed by indigenous peoples, being part of their heritage, cultures and livelihoods. Still, indigenous peoples are most often not sufficiently and effectively involved in the World Heritage Convention processes, and/or their rights and interests are violated and harmed by those processes. An International Expert Workshop on World Heritage and Indigenous Peoples was held in Denmark in 2012, where many disturbing examples were presented on how actions arising from commitments under the World Heritage Convention affect indigenous peoples.

On the other hand, the establishment and management of world heritage sites can have great benefits for indigenous peoples and local communities, if the international and national actors are willing to implement and enforce a respectful, rights-based approach to world heritage, with respect for human rights’ standards, justice for all, and other standards of good governance, equality, freedom, dignity and non-discrimination. Moreover, the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the implementation of the Convention will have great benefits for the sustainability and long-term protection of World Heritage sites.

From the aforementioned Call to Action we support, in particular, the calls by indigenous peoples for the World Heritage Committee to urgently establish a process to elaborate, with the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples, changes to the Operational Guidelines and other appropriate measures, for ensuring that indigenous peoples’ rights, as expressed in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and other human rights standards, are respected in World Heritage sites and in the implementation of the Convention. Such changes should affirm and guarantee, among others, the free, prior and fully-informed consent of indigenous peoples, as rights-holders and not merely stakeholders, before any decision affecting them is taken.

Bonn, 27 June 2015



Resolution 1

On No-go and No-impact Measures for Extractives Activities in Natural and Mixed World Heritage Sites

Submitted by: Zoological Society of London on behalf of the Africa Natural World Heritage Site Support Network

Civil Society Organizations having attended the conference “The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society” organized by World Heritage Watch on 26-27 June 2015 in Bonn, coming from 32 countries in 5 continents, as active and concerned citizens dealing with Natural and Cultural World Heritage properties at different places, and as civil society actors complementing the responsibility carried by governments and state bodies, appeal to the members of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee on its 39th Session with the following concern:

Natural World Heritage sites are the flagships of the global network of protected areas. Although they cover less than 1% of the world’s surface, they contain a wealth of irreplaceable flora, fauna and ecosystems that the international community has committed to safeguard for future generations.

Despite the legal protection bestowed upon World Heritage properties, humanity’s growing demand for natural resources has placed an increasing number of UNESCO natural World Heritage sites under threat, in particular from extractive activities.^{1, 2} While recognising the economic benefits that mineral, oil and gas exploration and extraction can bring to host countries, the potential environmental impacts are vast, and include habitat destruction, deforestation, biodiversity loss, water pollution and topsoil contamination. Such environmental impacts and potential loss of World Heritage may limit the possibilities for alternative, longer-term, more community-focused, sustainable development.

Urgent action is required to stop the trend of increasing encroachment of extractive industries on natural World Heritage sites. While a number of companies and industry groups in the mining, oil/gas and finance sectors have committed to no-go policies of varying scope for World Heritage sites³, many other companies have yet to make such a pledge, and action by other key stakeholders beyond the private sector is also necessary to ensure effective, universal protection for World Heritage sites.

The World Heritage Committee, the body responsible for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, and UNESCO’s World Heritage Centre maintain that oil, gas and mineral exploration and exploitation is incompatible with World Heritage status.

¹ By extractive activities, we refer to industrial-scale exploration, extraction and processing of minerals, metals, hydrocarbons and other geological materials. However, we recognise that other non-industrial extractive activities such as artisanal small-scale mining also have negative impacts on protected areas.

² More than a quarter of natural World Heritage Sites worldwide are estimated to be under pressure from existing or future mining and energy activities (*Analytical summary of the state of conservation of World Heritage Properties*, UNESCO, Paris, 2009).

³ A no-go policy refers here to the public commitment by a company to not carry out or support extractives activities in a World Heritage site. Commitments by companies, however, vary widely between specific sectors (e.g. all extractives or just mining), activities (e.g. exploration, extraction, processing and/or associated infrastructure development), geographical coverage (e.g. within and/or in the vicinity of a World Heritage site), type of site (e.g. World Heritage site, natural World Heritage site and/or specific categories of IUCN protected area) and degree of responsibility (e.g. “will not fund” versus “will not knowingly fund”).

The Committee reiterated this position at its June 2014 meeting, calling “on other companies in extractive industries and investment banks to follow these examples to further extend the no-go commitment”.⁴

It is the position of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the formal advisory body to the World Heritage Convention on natural World Heritage, that both natural and mixed World Heritage Sites should be protected from extractive activities. IUCN states that “mineral and oil/gas exploration and exploitation (including associated infrastructure and activities) is incompatible with the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage sites and should not be permitted.”

IUCN further states that “mineral and oil/gas exploration and exploitation outside World Heritage sites should not, under any circumstances, have negative impacts on their Outstanding Universal Value” and “should be subject to an appropriate and vigorous appraisal process... prior to considering whether to grant consents and licences.” In reaction to the June 2014 World Heritage Committee meeting, IUCN reiterated its opposition to extractive activities in World Heritage sites.

We support IUCN’s position on extractive activities in and around natural and mixed World Heritage sites as detailed in IUCN’s March 2013 advice note on mining and oil/gas projects.

Specifically, we call for:

- States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to fulfill their obligations regarding the preservation of these important properties. In particular, we encourage States Parties to:
- cancel all existing mining and oil/gas concessions that overlap World Heritage sites and allocate no such concessions in future;
- include in national legislation an off-limits provision for mining and oil/gas exploration and exploitation in World Heritage Sites;
- include in national legislation a stipulation that appropriate and rigorous preemptive appraisal processes, such as international best practice environmental and social impact assessments, must be undertaken for all mining and oil/gas exploration and exploitation activities that may affect World Heritage sites.

The World Heritage Committee to:

- consider including in the World Heritage Convention’s Policy Guidelines clear guidance on the above provisions for State Party national legislation;
- support the establishment of a World Heritage civil society network to assist States Parties and the Advisory Bodies with monitoring, management and reporting of their World Heritage Sites.

Bonn, 27 June 2015

⁴ See WHC-14/38.COM/16: Decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session (Doha, 2014), page 13, available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2014/whc14-38com-16en.pdf>.



WORLD HERITAGE WATCH

Resolution 2

On World Natural Heritage Properties in the Russian Federation

Submitted by: Greenpeace Russia

Civil Society Organizations having attended the conference “The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society” organized by World Heritage Watch on 26-27 June 2015 in Bonn, coming from 32 countries in 5 continents, as active and concerned citizens dealing with Natural and Cultural World Heritage properties at different places, and as civil society actors complementing the responsibility carried by government, state bodies and institutions, appeal to the members of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee on its 39th Session with the following concern:

1. In connection with the fact that Russian authorities already made decisions regarding such World Natural properties as “Virgin Komi Forests”, “Natural Complex of Wrangel Island Reserve” and “Golden Mountains of Altai” that could lead to loss of their Outstanding Universal Value, or where activities which lead to the loss of Outstanding Universal Value are already conducted, and taking into account that in correspondence with Art. 180 of the Operational Guidelines, this corresponds to the criteria of inscription of these properties in the “List of World Heritage in Danger”, to inscribe the above-mentioned World Heritage properties in the “List of World Heritage in Danger”.
2. In relation to “Volcanoes of Kamchatka” in addition to requests stated in the Draft Decision 39 COM 7B.20 (<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2015/whc15-39com-7BAdd-en.pdf>), we propose to add the draft Decision with a point of the following content:

The World Heritage Committee:

 - Notes with concern that the Government of Kamchatsky Krai, in agreement with the Ministry of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation, has developed and published draft new Regulations of the “Volcanoes of Kamchatka” Nature Park, uniting four nature parks (“Bystrinsky”, “Nalychevo”, “Yuzhno-Kamchatsky” and “Kliuchevskoy”) which foresees the permission for geological survey of the subsoil on the park territory as well as the removal on the ban on prospecting works and mining operations.
 - Confirms its position regarding the fact that any activity connected with prospecting and mining operations is not compatible with the World Heritage status and requests the State Party not to remove the ban on conduction of geological survey, prospecting and mining works on the territory of the property.
3. To request the UNESCO World Heritage Center to request from the State Party of the Russian Federation in shortest terms to submit to the Center the information about plans of the construction of tourist and sport objects inside the area of “Western Caucasus” World Heritage property as well as about planned changes of the protected area boundaries inside the composition of the property for further examination by the World Heritage Committee on its 40th Session in 2016, reserving in the case of confirmation of an existing or potential threat to its Outstanding Universal Value, its inscription in the “List of World Heritage in Danger”.
4. To recommend urgently to the States Parties to the Convention to prohibit direct or indirect participation of state companies in any activity that could lead to the destruction of the World Heritage properties on the territories of other countries, in particular to the State party of China to stop negotiations with the State Party of the Russian Federation regarding gas delivery via the so-called “western route” through the territory of the “Golden Mountains of Altai” World Heritage property.



WORLD HERITAGE WATCH

Resolution 3

On Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)

Submitted by: Rivers without Boundaries Coalition

Civil Society Organizations having attended the conference “The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society” organized by World Heritage Watch on the 26-27th June 2015, coming from 32 states in 5 continents, as active and concerned citizens dealing with different kinds of Natural and Cultural World Heritage at different places, and as agents of civil society taking additional responsibility complementing the responsibility carried by governments and state bodies, are concerned about the situation around Lake Baikal.

Being the most ancient lake on the planet, Lake Baikal contains 20% of freshwater on Earth and has more than 2,500 aquatic species, half of them endemic to the lake. The Outstanding Universal Values of Lake Baikal WHS are threatened both by existing hydropower reservoir operation in Russia and a planned dam cascade in Mongolia. This became possible because of:

- Lack of a vision for coherent management plan for the Lake Baikal WH property and ecosystem health monitoring system despite a great need.
- Lack of recognition of hydropower impacts on Baikal by the WHC, Mongolian and Russian governments, and the hydropower industry.
- Underestimation of urgency for climate adaptation planning and action in the Baikal-Angara Basin.
- Repeated non-compliance with the Convention on the part of Mongolia who continues pushing for large dam development in the Lake Baikal basin with support from the World Bank.
- Violation by the World Bank of its own environmental and social safeguard policies, which led to identification of hydropower dams as potential development projects in water-scarce Mongolia and neglect the development of the far more potent solar and wind resources of Mongolia.
- Obstacles to public participation in conservation and development planning in both Mongolia and Russia.

Today is the turning point for Lake Baikal and its basin. It will either become a technocratic system managed primarily for hydropower and interests of big industry or will be protected managed as natural world heritage site for the benefit of local people and humankind. Water Resources Management is a natural unifying core theme of the future Baikal WHS Management Plan. Lake level regulation by pre-existing hydropower should be conducted in the interest of ecosystem health and resilience is the key objective of such plan. Development of new large dams in the Lake Baikal Basin should be halted as incompatible with protection of OUV of the World Heritage Site.

Draft WHC decision can be improved by instilling a sense of urgency and adding important detail. We agree with the conclusions and recommendations of the IUCN Reactive Mission, and suggest that Draft Decision 39 COM 7B.22 should include the following concerns:

1. WHC should express growing concern that that large dam development pursued by the State Party of Mongolia in Selenge basin at Shuren, Orkhon, Eg and other river courses constitute serious potential threat to OUV of Baikal and planning process. **
2. WHC should request that the State Party of Mongolia
 - a. redevelops the terms of reference of the EIAs of the Shuren and Orkhon Gobi projects according to the IUCN World Heritage Advice Note. Those EIAs should address all potential impacts of the projects on the property inconsideration of the OUV of the property and provide for wide public consultation process in Baikal lake area.*

- b. provides to WHC review EIAs from each specific hydropower project in Selenge basin.*
- c. implements Cumulative Impact Assessment that should cover all of the infrastructure projects planned for the Selenge River Basin. This CIA should primarily concentrate on impacts of water infrastructure and mineral extraction and processing both existing and planned.***
- d. will not approve any of the projects until the EIAs and other relevant documentation have been reviewed by WHC/IUCN.*
3. Request the State Party of the Russian Federation to submit to the WHC, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th Session, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, including:
- a. existing provisions and regulations for water use and management in Lake Baikal draft amendments to those regulations.*
- b. monitoring-based information on effects of water level management not only on the hydrology, but also on the ecological processes and biodiversity of the property, as well as hydropower plant and water supply management downstream of the property.**
4. Invite both States Parties to continue and strengthen their cooperation and to jointly develop a Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Lake Baikal Basin water management * *but limited to hydropower development*, including:
- a. any future hydropower and other large water management and industrial development projects which could potentially affect the property.
- b. comprehensive Analysis of Alternatives for the planned hydropower projects including all different energy supply options and their environmental costs, including coal, wind, solar, pumped-storage, efficient management of overall energy system as well as trans-boundary opportunities to improve energy system efficiency through Silk Road and Steppe Path cooperation policies and development of Asia SuperGrid.
- c. effects of climate fluctuation on the Lake basin ecosystems and analysis of possible management measures for adaptation of water management to current and future climate conditions.
- d. evaluation of existing water management plans and regulations in the Lake basin and their effects for preservation of OUV of the property.
- e. initial steps to develop a "Lake Baikal Basin Water Ecosystems and Water Resources Management Plan" as a central part of "integrated management plan for the property". (A SEA is the best possible scoping exercise for defining form and contents of future basin-wide water management plans).
- To conduct SEAs, the two parties will likely need technical assistance, because none of them is a party to Espoo Convention and both have little experience in SEA. Therefore WHC may also offer to support proper implementation of SEA according to international standards.**
5. Noting lessons from Lake Turkana Parks property suffering destruction from hydropower despite WHC intervention, it is important that WHC urges financial institutions to abstain from funding any of the projects until the EIAs, CIA and SEA have been prepared, measures to safeguard OUV values agreed and all documentation reviewed by WHC/IUCN.**
6. We encourage the World Bank Board of Directors to ensure a mandatory public participation process in the course of any dam-related studies and planning processes both in Mongolia and Russia, and task the WB Inspection Panel to carry out a full investigation of the MINIS Project that supported Shuren and Orkhon dam planning without due prior evaluation of risks and available alternatives. Such investigation is especially important given that WB safeguards are being revised and any evidence of breaches in existing safeguards and procedures may help to improve future rules.

Bonn, 27 June 2015

* This item was later included in the WHC Decision

** This item was later not included in the WHC Decision

*** This item was later partly included in the WHC Decision



WORLD HERITAGE WATCH

Resolution 4

On the Western Caucasus (Russian Federation)

Submitted by: Environmental Watch on Northern Caucasus

Civil Society Organizations having attended the conference “The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society” organized by World Heritage Watch on 26-27 June 2015 in Bonn, coming from 32 countries in 5 continents, as active and concerned citizens dealing with Natural and Cultural World Heritage properties at different places, and as civil society actors complementing the responsibility carried by governments and state bodies, pass the following resolution:

1. The UNESCO World Heritage Committee should urge the Russian Government to immediately join the upper parts of the Mzymta River to the Caucasus Reserve in accordance with the „Action Plan for Restauration of the Mzymta River ecosystem, complex environmental monitoring and preparation of the compensatory measures in the framework of the environmental accompaniment of the XXII Olympic Games and XI Paralympic Winter Games in Sochi“, which was adopted by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of the Russian Federation.

The UNESCO World Heritage Committee decided on its 37th Session to request that the Russian government stops any construction or enlargement of existing structures in the upper reaches of the Mzymta River, and to strengthen the legal status of this wilderness area. Russia’s obligation to strengthen its legal status by adding it to the Caucasus Reserve has not been carried out. The construction of recreational infrastructure on this territory and signing of agreements between companies and the Caucasus Reserve go against the decisions of World Heritage Committee.

2. The area of the Sochi National Park in the upper parts of the Mzymta River is now considered by the World Heritage Committee as a part of the renomination plan of the Western Caucasus property. Therefore, its protection status of the core area should not be reduced to the status of recreation area, as the Rosa Khutor Corporation demands. Russian authorities should take urgent measures to stop the construction of the new infrastructure features by the Rosa Khutor, before the decision of the renomination is adopted by the World Heritage Committee.
3. The expansion plans of the OAO Gazprom aimed to remove the Pseashkho massif from the World nature heritage property Western Caucasus in order to develop new sky resorts are violation of the UNESCO Convention and therefore not acceptable and should be banned.
4. The World Heritage Committee should strengthen cooperation with NGOs, concerning tasks of the World Natural Heritage Site “Western Caucasus”.

Bonn, 27 June 2015



WORLD HERITAGE WATCH

Resolution 5

On the Preservation of Pirin National Park (Bulgaria)

Submitted by: For the Nature Coalition

Civil Society Organizations having attended the conference “The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society” organized by World Heritage Watch on 26-27 June 2015 in Bonn, coming from 32 countries in 5 continents, as active and concerned citizens dealing with Natural and Cultural World Heritage properties at different places, and as civil society actors complementing the responsibility carried by governments and state bodies, alarmed by the damage already caused to Pirin National Park World Heritage Property in Bulgaria, and the current level of threat to the future of the Property,

- Recognise the Outstanding Universal Values (OUV) of Pirin National Park as a World Heritage Site (WHS), the role the site plays for sustainable regional development, and the broad-based support of the local community towards nature conservation in the region.
- Note with great concern that despite the park’s legal protection under the World Heritage Convention as a World Heritage Property and under European and national laws as a National park (IUCN Category II) and Natura 2000 site under Birds and Habitats Directives, and that despite the fact that Bulgarian NGOs have notified the World Heritage Committee (WHC) about the threat of the Bankso Ski Zone in 2000-2001 before the development began, and that despite legal actions undertaken to prevent damage to the property, Bulgarian national institutions have allowed the site to be degraded through inappropriate development.
- Note with great concern that the “OUV of the property has been repeatedly and significantly impacted by the development of ski facilities and ski runs” leading to the exclusion of two ski zones of Bansko and Dobrinishte from the property in 2010.
- Reiterate that the IUCN’s World Heritage Outlook assessment of the Property as of “Significant Concern” due to continuous threats and problems with management of the Property, as well as the following:
 1. The draft updated Management Plan (MP) of the Property⁵ includes significant downgrading of management regimes and neglects the recommendations of the WHC. Initially comprising less than 1% of the Property, the updated draft MP extends the zones which allow construction to nearly 65% of the Property. The Bulgarian Ministry of the Environment and Water (MoEW) has to date accepted this concept and has refused to subject the new construction regimes to a Strategic Environmental Assessment. This is non-compliant with the WHC decisions, especially with respect to the recommendations on the management of buffer zones. In addition, the management of the rest of the Property is clearly inadequate, allowing for forest logging, poaching and overgrazing.
 2. The draft⁶ amendment of the Ski Zone Concession Contract provides the concessioner to be granted 1069.58 ha of the Property and its buffer zone for construction of ski facilities instead of the current 99.55 ha, an increase of more than 1000%. In addition, the government refuses to issue acts for state ownership of lifts, ski runs and restaurants, allowing the concessionaire Yulen JSC to illegally transfer ski lifts under concession to one of its owners (an offshore company) - a violation of the national legislation on concessions and state property.

⁵ to be approved in 2015

⁶ http://forthenature.org/upload/documents/2015/03/proekto-reshenie%20MS_KD%20Bansko_23.02.15.pdf

In order to secure the Outstanding Universal Values of the Pirin National Park World Heritage Property we call upon:

1. The Bulgarian Government to take its international commitments seriously and implement the decisions of the World Heritage Committee (WHC), and in doing so, comply with the World Heritage Convention and international and national legislation;
2. The WHC to immediately include the Property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;
3. UNESCO/WHC to publicly appeal to the Bulgarian Government for strict implementation of the decisions of the WHC.
4. The WHC to improve its policy of transparency of the World Heritage Convention, especially in correspondence between the state party and the WHC, to speed up the exchange of information and the adoption of effective solutions that meet the spirit of the Convention. The decision of the WHC should be proactive and constructive and not followed by retreat and exclusion of zones.
5. The WHC to involve more effectively the national and international NGOs and networks into all of its procedures, processes and structures as, in the case of this property, it is only the eNGOs that are involved in the legal protection and monitoring of the status of the Property. A comprehensive, representational and adequate procedure of consultation with NGOs and direct participation in decision-making prior and during the WHC meetings should be established.

We acknowledge the IUCN World Heritage Outlook as an effective tool to raise the awareness of the international community on the status of World Heritage, and the efforts of the Bulgarian nature conservation NGOs united in the 'For the Nature Coalition' to defend the Pirin National Park World Heritage Site.

Bonn, 27 June 2015



Resolution 6

On Hasankeyf and the Iraqi Marshes

Submitted by: Save the Tigris and Iraqi Marshes Campaign, on behalf of:

1. Iraqi People's Campaign to Save the Tigris
2. Civil Development Organization (CDO)
3. Tammuz Organization for Social Development
4. Information Center for Research and Development
5. Al-Mesalla Organization for Human Resources Development
6. Initiative to Keep Hasankeyf Alive
7. Centre for Sustainable Development (CENESTA)
8. Iraqi Civil Society Solidarity Initiative (ICSSI)
9. Un Ponte Per...
10. The Corner House
11. Gegenstroemung / Countercurrent
12. Environmental Defenders Law Center

Civil Society Organizations having attended the conference "The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society" organized by World Heritage Watch on 26-27 June 2015 in Bonn, coming from 32 countries in 5 continents, as active and concerned citizens dealing with Natural and Cultural World Heritage properties at different places, and as civil society actors complementing the responsibility carried by governments and state bodies, appeal to the members of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee on its 39th Session with great concern about the threats to the outstanding value of the cultural and natural sites of Mesopotamia, due to the great risks posed by the ongoing Ilisu Dam project, as well as other dams being constructed in Turkey on the Tigris River.

The fate of the Marshlands of Southern Mesopotamia (Iraqi Marshes) as well the 12,000-year-old city of Hasankeyf on the banks of the Tigris River in Southeastern Turkey, which according to an independent study* fulfills 9 out of 10 World Heritage criteria, is at stake. All of this is happening without consulting Iraq and without any study of the effects on the downstream countries.

Since 2012, more than 35,000 people have signed a petition <http://www.dogadernegi.org/userfiles/pagefiles/hasankeyf-raporlar/hskyfunescoing.pdf> demanding the protection of Hasankeyf and the Iraqi Marshes.

Large dams are a threat to the Marshes. The situation of the Marshes is deteriorating day by day, the area is already subject to severe droughts, water is scarce, and native inhabitants are migrating from the Marshes due to lack of water. The conviction of the Save the Tigris and Iraqi Marshes Campaign as well as other concerned Iraqi and international civil society organizations, is that the inclusion of the Iraqi Marshes in the Cultural and Natural Heritage List has become urgent: To safeguard the Marshes and maintain them for future generations should be a priority. However, a visit of the members of the World Heritage Committee to the Marshlands scheduled for this year (2015) has been postponed despite its importance for the completion of the file.

Recently, the Government of Iraq and the Kurdistan Regional Government succeeded in their efforts to submit the complete file of the Citadel of Erbil to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee. Today, Erbil Citadel is included in the list and as such its heritage will be protected for generations to come. Correspondingly, we wish to see the list of Iraqi heritage expanded and the Iraqi Marshes included.

In Turkey, for the city of Hasankeyf time is running out, and we urge the Turkish government to change its policies and to save its own and Iraq's potential world heritage.

We request

- The Iraqi government to inform the Iraqi public on the current status of the nomination procedure for the Iraqi Marshes, and the reasons for its delay;
- The Iraqi government, in cooperation with the UNESCO office in Iraq, to publish a timetable for the nomination of the Iraqi Marshes for the World Heritage List;
- The Iraqi government and the UNESCO World Heritage Committee to assess the downstream impacts of the Ilisu dam and to take all diplomatic and legal means to stop construction of dams with negative impacts on downstream heritage sites such as the Marshes;
- The Turkish government to stop the construction of Ilisu dam and to nominate the city of Hasankeyf as a World Heritage site.

Bonn, 27 June 2015



WORLD HERITAGE WATCH

Resolution 7

On Threatened Cultural Heritage in Bulgaria

Submitted by: Konstantina Pehlivanova

Civil Society Organizations having attended the conference “The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society” organized by World Heritage Watch on 26-27 June 2015 in Bonn, coming from 32 countries in 5 continents, as active and concerned citizens dealing with Natural and Cultural World Heritage properties at different places, and as civil society actors complementing the responsibility carried by governments and state bodies,

noting that Bulgaria has ratified the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (the World Heritage Convention) and has thereby agreed to abide by the principles stated in this document;

affirming the collective interest of the international community to cooperate in the protection of cultural heritage, as the latter is a unique and irreplaceable source of history and culture;

recalling further that authenticity is essential for retaining and transmitting the values attributed to cultural heritage, as it certifies credibility and truthfulness of the historical evidence, and clarifies and illuminates the collective memory of humanity;

requests the Bulgarian authorities to discontinue all current reconstructions of cultural heritage sites, based on conjecture, as they are at odds with international principles and ethics of scientific restoration and with paragraph 86 of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, and thus cause an irreversible loss of authenticity;

expresses agreement with Letter GA/GJ/66 of April 8th 2015 issued by ICOMOS INTERNATIONAL and addressed to the Bulgarian authorities regarding endangered cultural heritage in Bulgaria;

supports the efforts of the Bulgarian civil society, of the Bulgarian CULTURAL HERITAGE FORUM and of the Bulgarian National Committee of ICOMOS for safeguarding the authenticity of cultural heritage and for confirming the expertise-based approach to its conservation.

Bonn, 27 June 2015



WORLD HERITAGE WATCH

Resolution 8

On the Protection of St. Sofia and its Related Buildings, Kyiv (Ukraine)

Submitted by: Save Old Kiev

Civil Society Organizations having attended the conference “The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society” organized by World Heritage Watch on 26-27 June 2015 in Bonn, coming from 32 countries in 5 continents, as active and concerned citizens dealing with Natural and Cultural World Heritage properties at different places, and as civil society actors complementing the responsibility carried by governments and state bodies, hereby address the UNESCO World Heritage Committee, kindly asking for intervention regarding the following issues:

1. We ask the Committee to request Ukraine to provide, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, all detailed information on major restoration projects or new constructions in the the territory and buffer zone of Object 527 by 1 February 2016 for examination, and possibly decision, of the World Heritage Committee at its 40th Session in 2016.
2. We ask the World Heritage Committee to urge Ukraine again to adopt a law that imposes a moratorium on all high-rise and non-conforming buildings within the boundaries of the World Heritage Property in Kyiv (Decision 33 COM 7B.125).
3. We ask World Heritage Committee to recommend Ukraine to take necessary steps in order to reduce the height of high-rise buildings with underground parking lots in the buffer zone of the Saint Sophia Cathedral – on O. Honchara str. 17-23, on Desyatynny Lane 3-5, on Klovsyy Spusk 7, and on Riznytska 2. Recommendations concerning the project on O. Honchara str. have been provided by ICOMOS as early as October 2009 (WHC-10/34.COM/7B, and the letter WHC/74/2049/UA/AS/FB signed by Director of the World Heritage Center Mr. Bandarin).

Bonn, 27 June 2015



WORLD HERITAGE WATCH

Resolution 9

On the Gas Street Lamps in Berlin (Germany)

Submitted by: Denk-mal-an-Berlin e.V.

We the participants of the World Heritage Watch International Conference in Bonn, coming from more than 40 states in 5 continents,

- as active and concerned citizens dealing with different kinds of Natural and Cultural World Heritage at different places,
- and as agents of civil society taking additional responsibility complementing the responsibility carried by government or state bodies and institutions,
- knowing that the Gas Light and Gas Lamps in Berlin are on the 2014 Watch List of endangered World Heritage published by World Monuments Fund in New York,
- presuming that relevant final decision-making on the Berlin budget is already fast moving,
- knowing that the removal of the Gas Light and Gas Lamps cannot be justified environmentally nor economically, as figures the Senate of Berlin published are contradictory, highly misleading and showing a serious questionable discrepancy,
- based on qualified cross-cutting expertises on the evaluation of Gas Light and Gas Lamps having the potential of World Heritage – both in social and cultural terms in particular (with regards to their value and identity importance),

hereby address the UNESCO World Heritage Centre in Paris, kindly asking for immediate intervention regarding the highly endangered Cultural World Heritage of Gas Light and Gas Lamps in Berlin:

As there is now very little time left to act (see above), we would highly appreciate immediate action in order to save the still existing and working Gas Light and Gas Lamps system representing the world's largest ensemble of this industrial and technical heritage.

We hereby ask UNESCO World Heritage Centre to address

- the Government (Senat) of Berlin,
- the Parliament (Abgeordnetenhaus) of Berlin
- asking them to re-think most seriously their decision taken regarding the demolition of this potential acknowledged World Cultural Heritage.

Bonn, 27 June 2015



WORLD HERITAGE WATCH

Resolution 10

On Lake Bogoria (Kenya)

Submitted by: Endorois Welfare Council

Civil Society Organizations having attended the conference “The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society” organized by World Heritage Watch on 26-27 June 2015 in Bonn, coming from 32 countries in 5 continents, as active and concerned citizens dealing with Natural and Cultural World Heritage properties at different places, and as civil society actors complementing the responsibility carried by governments and state bodies, expressing solidarity with the Endorois Welfare Council (Kenya), are concerned with situation around Lake Bogoria.

In 1973, Lake Bogoria was gazetted as National Game Reserve (NGR) by the Government of Kenya, dispossessing the Endorois indigenous people of their ancestral land - the land of their sacred shrines, graves of their ancestors and medicinal herbs. Houses were torched and every household compensated with a meager KES 3,150 (35 USD). Other promises made to the Endorois have remained unfulfilled until today. Since then, Lake Bogoria NGR has generated an average of KES 60 million (650,000 USD) annually from gate collections for the last 40 years, but the Endorois have not benefitted from this revenue.

With these injustices, Endorois Welfare Council (EWC) was born to champion community rights in 1995. The legal battles with the government of the day resulted in threats, torture, arbitrary arrests and detentions.

The Endorois took the government to court in 1997, but after 6 years in and out of courtrooms in Kenya they could not get justice at home. With the help of partners, CEMIRIDE & MRG took the case to the African Commission for Human & Peoples Rights in 2003. After 7 years, a landmark ruling in favour of the Endorois was adopted by the African Heads of State in 2010 in Ethiopia.

The African Commission decided (in March 2010) that the government of Kenya

- Recognize the rights of ownership of the Endorois and restitute Endorois ancestral lands;
- Ensure that the Endorois Community has unrestricted access to Lake Bogoria and surrounding sites for religious and cultural rites and for grazing their cattle;
- Pay adequate compensation to the community for all losses suffered;
- Pay royalties to the Endorois from existing economic activities and ensure they benefit from employment possibilities within the Reserve;
- Grant registration to the Endorois Welfare Council;
- Engage in dialogue with the complainants for the effective implementation of these recommendations.
- Report on the implementation of these recommendations within three months from the date of notification.

Against this backdrop, Lake Bogoria was declared a World Heritage Site in June 2011 without consulting the Endorois and without their Free Prior and Informed Consent.

Recommendations

The World Heritage Committee, UNESCO and IUCN should insist that the Government of Kenya

- fully implement the ACHPR decision and return the land to the Endorois;

- ensure the full and effective participation of the Endorois people in the management, governance and benefits of Lake Bogoria National Game Reserve, through their own representative organization (EWC);
- ensure that the Endorois equitably share the benefits of the World Heritage site;
- ensure unrestricted access of the Endorois to Lake Bogoria for religious and cultural rites, and for grazing their cattle, in line with the ACHPR Decision;
- will not use the World Heritage status of lands to which the Endorois have a recognized claim as a pretext to deny them the restitution of these lands because they are a UNESCO World Heritage site.

Bonn, 27 June 2015



WORLD HERITAGE WATCH

Resolution 11

On the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Japan)

Submitted by: Japan ICOMOS Committee

Civil Society Organizations having attended the conference “The UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Society” organized by World Heritage Watch on 26-27 June 2015 in Bonn, coming from 32 countries in 5 continents, as active and concerned citizens dealing with Natural and Cultural World Heritage properties at different places, and as civil society actors complementing the responsibility carried by governments and state bodies, would like to show our respect to Hiroshima City for its efforts in preserving the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) thus contributing toward achieving permanent world peace.

We express our concern about the on-going plans to relocate the Floating Oyster Restaurant upstream from its current position downstream the Heiwa Ohashi bridge, as the plans have been granted permission to be carried forward from both Hiroshima City and the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism.

The Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) is a special place that tells the tragic parts of history that humanity has lived through; it is a special place to pray for permanent world peace. Also, as a heritage valuable for all humanity, it has been inscribed on the List of World Heritage under criterion (vi) only, like the site of Auschwitz in Poland.

The site’s buffer zone should be recognized as being not only the area which aims at regulating and organizing the settings and surrounding landscape of the world heritage property, but also as an area that is deeply connected to the meaning of prayer to world peace and repose of souls that the property carries.

The ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Legal, Administrative and Financial Issues has made recommendations regarding the buffer zone of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) in 2006; it is also from the standpoint of implementing these recommendations that the Japan ICOMOS National Committee is strongly interested in these issues of the relocation of the Floating Oyster Restaurant.

The Japan ICOMOS National Committee cannot but be strongly concerned about the place where the Floating Oyster restaurant is planned to be relocated: even though it would be in the buffer zone, the floating restaurant is going to come closer to the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome), and although it may be on the opposite bank of the river, this is still just aside the Peace Memorial Park on the left bank of the river, where there are great numbers of memorial monuments.

This is why we think that before a final decision is made, it is necessary to hold fair and thorough discussions that involve a greater part of citizens as well as victims of the atomic bomb.

In the past years, the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) has become a place that great numbers of foreign tourists visit, and the Memorial’s role as a source of information and a place to visit under the theme of world peace is highly valued throughout the world. Therefore, we deem it essential that this issue be dealt under a global viewpoint as well as a multilateral, international awareness. We support the Japan ICOMOS National Committee in their efforts to cooperate and keep supporting the City of Hiroshima in its endeavor to enhance the value of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome).

VI. Annexes

The Authors and Moderators

Lisa Ackerman

Lisa Ackerman is Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of World Monuments Fund, an organization founded in 1965 which has assisted in the conservation and development of long-term stewardship strategies at more than 600 sites in 100 countries. Ms. Ackerman is a Visiting Assistant Professor at Pratt Institute. Previously she served as Executive Vice President of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, a private foundation dedicated to European art and architecture from antiquity through the 19th century. Ms. Ackerman holds an MS degree in Historic Preservation from Pratt Institute, an MBA from New York University, and a BA from Middlebury College. She has been serving on the boards of various bodies related to heritage and the arts, and has received several awards for her achievements.



Tim Badman



Tim Badman is the Director of IUCN's World Heritage Programme, and has been senior IUCN spokesperson on World Heritage since 2007. He speaks for IUCN on all matters concerning the World Heritage Convention, including IUCN's work on monitoring all listed natural sites and evaluating new proposals for World Heritage Listing.

Tim joined IUCN having worked as team leader of the Dorset and East Devon Coast World Heritage Site, UK. His role culminated in inscription of the site on the World Heritage List in 2001, and the subsequent development of the World Heritage programme on-site. He has been involved in many World Heritage site evaluation and monitoring issues globally.

Tim also speaks for IUCN on the special challenges of conserving geological sites, including those sites that protect the most exceptional fossil remains of life on earth.

Yunus Arbi



Yunus Arbi (54) is a cultural heritage specialist with background studies in archeology and museology. His work is focusing on the preparation on the tentative list, the nomination process and the management of world cultural heritage sites at the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia. He has been involved in the nomination

process of the Cultural Landscape of Bali Province since 2008. He actively initiated to coordinate with local and international experts, stakeholders, and communities to continue the nomination process focusing on subak system and water-associated temples, and continues in supporting the management of the WH Property since its inscription in 2012 by organizing several studies on participatory mapping of the sites, stakeholder meetings, and publications.

Francesco Bandarin



Francesco Bandarin is UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Culture, a position which he had already from 2010 to 2014. From 2000 to 2011, he served as Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Trained as an architect (Venice, 1975) and urban planner (UC Berkeley, 1977), he is presently Professor of Urban Planning at the University IUAV of Venice. He has also been a consultant for international organizations in the field of urban conservation and development, was Director of the Special Projects Office for the Safeguarding of Venice and its Lagoon, and Director of Special Programmes for the 2000 Jubilee Preparations in Rome. He has published numerous works, and co-authored "The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing in an Urban Century", 2012, and "Reconnecting the City", 2014. Prof. Bandarin also serves on the Advisory Council for CyArk's "500 Challenge".

He has also been a consultant for international organizations in the field of urban conservation and development, was Director of the Special Projects Office for the Safeguarding of Venice and its Lagoon, and Director of Special Programmes for the 2000 Jubilee Preparations in Rome. He has published numerous works, and co-authored "The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing in an Urban Century", 2012, and "Reconnecting the City", 2014. Prof. Bandarin also serves on the Advisory Council for CyArk's "500 Challenge".

Nicole Bolomey and Arpakwa Sikorei



Nicole Bolomey, 48, is a landscape architect, conservation professional, and independent consultant. She has 9 years of field experience working for UNESCO on a variety of World Heritage sites in Asia and Africa. A heritage consultant in Tanzania and Liechtenstein, she has conducted the UNESCO-led dialogue titled 'People and Wildlife, Past Present and Future' in Ngorongoro from 2013 - end-2014.

Arpakwa Sikorei, 30, is a native Masaai who was born and raised inside the Ngorongoro World Heritage site. He has a degree in Wildlife Management and has worked in wildlife protection for NGOs, FAO and UNESCO in Tanzania. As a consultant for culture, conservation and local development in Arusha, Tanzania, he is active in wildlife and natural heritage protection. Currently, he is enrolled at the Turin School of Development in the Master program in World Heritage and Cultural Projects for Development.

Mounir Bouchenaki



Prof. Mounir Bouchenaki (1943) is an Algerian archaeologist and incumbent Director of the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage. He joined UNESCO in 1982, was Director-General of ICCROM from 2006 to 2011, Assistant Director-General for Culture (2000-2006), Director of the World Heritage Centre (1998-2000), and Director of UNESCO's Cultural

Heritage Division (1990-2000). In the field of the intangible cultural heritage, he ran the programme of the Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity from its inception to 2006. In January 2011, he was named honorary special adviser of the UNESCO Director-General and of the ICCROM Director-General. At the beginning of his career, Mounir Bouchenaki obtained a Postgraduate Diploma in Ancient History at Algiers University, and went on to hold high positions in Algeria's cultural heritage sector between 1966 and 1981.

Sana Butler

Before Sana Butler, 42, founded Transformative Tourism Development Group, she crisscrossed the globe as a Newsweek travel correspondent for more than a decade. As the driving force behind awareness coverage of some of the world's most discriminating and recogniza-



ble five-star hotels, spas and cultural institutions, she has advised millions on the next big luxury travel trends. She was one of the first mainstream journalists to write about sustainable tourism and has been invited to speak at numerous United Nations World Tourism Organization conferences, advising tourism ministers on marketing and sustainable development. She is currently working with impact investors in Africa to redirect tourism's cash flow away from large multinational corporations and mega businesses and to the local people.

Christina Cameron



In 2005, Dr. Christina Cameron took up her present position as a Professor and leads a research program on heritage conservation in the School of Architecture at the Université de Montréal. For more than 35 years she held leadership positions in the heritage field at Parks Canada. As Director General of National Historic Sites, she provided national direction

for Canada's historic places, focussing on heritage conservation and education programs. She also served as the Secretary to the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada from 1986 to 2005. She has written extensively since the 1970s on Canadian architecture, heritage management and World Heritage issues. She has been actively involved in UNESCO's World Heritage as Head of the Canadian delegation (1990-2008) and as Chairperson (1990, 2008), has chaired numerous expert meetings, and is Vice-President of the Canadian Commission for UNESCO.

Alicia Castillo Mena



Dr. Alicia Castillo Mena is lecturer at the Complutense University of Madrid and specialist in Cultural Heritage Management. She is a member of ICOMOS and representative of Spain in the Scientific Committee of Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM). With an interdisciplinary and international team, she has led several national and international research projects about the management of World Heritage cities in Latin America and Europe. She codirected two international conferences on Best practices in World Heritage, where two reference documents about the topic were produced. The first conference was dedicated to Archaeology (2012), and the second to People and Communities (2015). Both events were celebrated in Menorca, Balearic Islands, Spain.

Alfredo Conti



Alfredo Conti studied and taught Architecture and Building Conservation in La Plata and Buenos Aires, and is now a professor of Heritage and Sustainable Tourism and Director of the UNESCO Chair on Cultural Tourism at La Plata University in Argentina. He started collaborating with ICOMOS in 1982, where he has had different positions such as

Secretary General, Vice-President and President of Argentina's National Committee. From 2000 onwards, he has represented ICOMOS in evaluation and monitoring missions to World Heritage properties in Latin America, and in the elaboration and follow-up of the periodic report on the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Latin America and the Caribbean. Since 2010 he has been ICOMOS' Vice-President and Chair of the World Heritage Working Group.

Pimpim de Azevedo

Pimpim de Azevedo is an artist and Tibetan architecture conservator. She received her Masters degree in Heritage Science from University College, London. Together with André Alexander, Pimpim established and managed the Tibet Heritage Fund (THF) in Lhasa, and has worked for THF up to the present day. She



worked to preserve the old city of Lhasa, and took part in architecture conservation projects in Amdo, Kham, Mongolia and India. From 1995 - 2004 she learned from Tibetan master builders different building techniques and materials used in traditional Tibetan houses and temples. During that time she did research on Tibetan architecture and building prior to the 1950s, which she is editing for an Illustrated Dictionary of Tibetan Architecture and a Compendium of Traditional Technology used in Tibetan Architecture.

Nicole De Togni

Nicole De Togni (1985) holds a PhD in History of Architecture and Planning from the Politecnico di Torino, Italy, 2015, with a dissertation on the negotiation implied in planning and building instruments in the Second Post War period. In 2010 she obtained a double M.Sc. Architecture at Politecnico di Milano and Politecnico di Torino, experiencing an academic year in the Royal Institute



of Technology in Stockholm, Sweden. She was a research fellow in the preparation of the nomination dossier "Ivrea, industrial city of the XX century" for the inclusion in the World Heritage List and previously collaborated in research activities for the inclusion of the site in the UNESCO Italian Tentative List. She is research and teaching assistant at the Politecnico di Milano for different courses in the field of history and theory of modern and contemporary architecture and planning.

Wiwik Dharmiasih



Wiwik Dharmiasih (32) is a lecturer at the Department of International Relations, Universitas Udayana in Bali, Indonesia. Her research focuses on some key themes in contemporary international relations such as political geography, conflict transformation, and community-based natural resources management. She provided social and legal

analysis for the World Heritage nomination of the Balinese irrigation system, *subak*, in 2010-2011, and was the Coordinator for Program and Planning at the Governing Assembly for Bali's Cultural Heritage in (2012). She was involved in the establishment of Forum *Pekaseh Catur Angga Batukau*, and is currently active in supporting community participation and youth involvement in the management system of the World Heritage Sites in Bali by initiating Project Kalpa and help *subak* preservation with Yayasan Sawah Bali, a local NGO based in Ubud, Bali.

Stephan Doempke



Stephan Doempke (1955) studied psychology, cultural anthropology and science of religions in Muenster, Wichita/Kansas and Berlin. He worked for traditional Southern Cheyenne in Oklahoma (USA) and other indigenous peoples of North America and the Pacific. In 1989 he joined the founding team at the

House of World Cultures in Berlin, organized the 2nd Global Radiation Victims Conference in 1992, and from 1993-1998 coordinated natural world heritage and biosphere reserve projects in Russia and Central Asia. He supported the revitalization of felt-making in Kyrgyzstan and did consultancies in Mongolia, Ethiopia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Montenegro. In 2008 he became UN Programme Coordinator for Culture and Heritage in Albania, and was an expert for World Heritage in Gjirokastra, Albania, from 2010-2014. He is the founder and chairman of World Heritage Watch.


Elke Falley-Rothkopf



Elke Falley-Rothkopf has studied Ethnology, Geography and German studies, and for almost 20 years has been on the board of the Institute for Ecology and Action-Anthropology (infoe) for the support of indigenous peoples against threats of destruction of their natural environment and the violation of their rights. She focuses on Latin America, and since 2008 on Peru in particular. Elke Falley-Rothkopf also organizes events. She has been involved in the implementation of an international narrative festival "Todas las palabras, todas" 2011 in Peru, and in 2013, within the project "Indigenous Voices and Visions", organized a Concert for the Amazon with Grupo Sal, the performance of the play "Te voy a contar" by the theater group Yuyachani from Peru, as well as various events with the Peruvian storyteller César "el Wayqui" Villegas.

Humberto Fernández Borja

Humberto Fernández Borja was born in 1946 in Mexico City where he resides. He studied economics and specialized in environmental conservation, cultural management and sustainable development. He is co-founder and Director of Conservación Humana AC, a Mexican non-for-profit and independent organisation founded in 1995; its mission is the conservation of the bio-cultural corridor of sacred routes and landscapes of the Huichol Indigenous Peoples. Humberto Fernandez has collaborated in projects related to the Man and the Biosphere as well as to the Natural Sacred Sites: Biological Diversity and Cultural Integrity programmes of UNESCO's Division of Ecological Sciences. He is responsible and preparer of the Nomination File of the Huichol Route through Sacred Sites to Huiricuta for the World Heritage List.



Anette Gangler



Dr. Anette Gangler, a private architect and urban planner, holds a master's degree and PhD from the University of Stuttgart. She has many years of professional experience in town, urban and regional planning in different, complex social environments in Southern Germany and the Arab World. In the Near East she implemented numerous urban devel-

opment and rehabilitation projects, as for example the interdisciplinary "Rehabilitation Project for the Historic City of Aleppo / Syria". She teaches Urban Planning at the Institute of Urbanism of the University of Stuttgart, and is involved in various urban cultural heritage research projects. At the University of Cottbus and Nürtingen as well as the Kalamoon University in Syria she taught in the areas of Urban Planning and "Cultural Heritage". She has been co-author in several books and has published numerous articles on Oriental cities.



Francesca Giliberto

Francesca Giliberto (1987) is a PhD student jointly supervised by the Politecnico di Torino (Italy) and the University of Kent (UK), conducting a comparative analysis of current urban management strategies in Italy and in the UK. In parallel, she worked as research fellow in the preparation of the UNESCO nomination dossier of "Ivrea, industrial city of the XX century". Previously, she obtained a M.Sc. degree in Architecture at Politecnico di Torino and Politecnico di Milano, studying for one year at the ENSA Paris-Belleville. In Paris, she did internships with ICOMOS where she followed the project "Monuments Watch 2012", collaborating with the World Monuments Fund, New York. Then, she obtained a 1st level specializing master in "World Heritage and Cultural Projects for Development" (Torino), in collaboration with UNESCO. Since 2012, she joined ICOMOS Italy as an effective member.

Daniela Glagla

Daniela Glagla, MA, born in 1981, studied Political Sciences, Science of Islam, and Modern German Literature in Bonn, Wrocław (Poland) and Alexandria (Egypt). Since 2010 she has been representing the faction of the political party "The Left" in the Rhineland Regional Association which is the largest operator of integration assistance programs in Germany. In addition, since 2011 she has been engaged as a member of the board of the Rosa Luxembourg Foundation of Northrhine-Westphalia in the design and implementation of educational programs meant to create discussion forums for left alternatives and culturally ambitious controversy. She is also active in the Rosa Luxembourg Club of her hometown of Düsseldorf.



Inge Gotzmann

Dr. Inge H. Gotzmann has earned a PhD in Biology from the University of Cologne where she also has been lecturing on the subject of Botany and Biological Didactics since 2001. Since 2002, she has been the federal director of Bund Heimat und Umwelt, an NGO umbrella organization focusing on raising awareness for sustainable land use, landscape assessment and planning, renewable energies, monument conservation and intangible heritage. Being a member of the Rhenian Association for Monument and Landscape Protection, Ms. Gotzmann has been involved in the Upper Middle Rhine Valley World Heritage site. Whatever time is left she splits between her duties as president of Civilscape, a European network of NGOs protecting landscapes, and as an NGO Member of the Jury for UNESCO Intangible Heritage nominations in the federal state of North Rhine - Westphalia.



Uli Gräbener


Uli Gräbener (1970) is a biologist with a broad background in natural sciences. After working for the Russian World Heritage Program of the German Association for Nature Conservation (NABU) from 1995-1999, he served as a seconded Junior Expert at the UNESCO Moscow Office from 1999 to 2004, where he

was in charge of the programs for Biosphere Reserves and World Natural Heritage. For the last ten years he has been responsible for monitoring and evaluation, quality management and efficiency in nature protection with WWF Germany. Since August 2015, he is CEO at the Michael Succow Foundation. He is mainly driven by the question how protection and sustainable use of natural resources may be combined.



Abdel Kader Haïdara

Dr. Abdel Kader Haïdara hails from Timbuktu and he is the founder and General Director of the Mamma Haïdara Library, named after his father. He is the Executive President of the Sauvegarde et Valorisation des Manuscrits pour la Défense de la Culture Islamique (SACAMA-DCI), an NGO that works to preserve and enhance the heritage of Mali, particularly the Arabic manuscripts of Timbuktu. In 1967, UNESCO initiated the Ahmed Baba Institute and sought



Dr. Haïdara's expertise in the manuscript preservation. He is the founder and member of many international organizations, such as the World Digital Library, an initiative of UNESCO and the US Library of Congress. Dr. Haïdara has published many works on libraries and manuscript conservation in Mali. Because of his successful rescue of 95% of the manuscripts housed in Timbuktu, he was granted the German Africa Award in 2014. Dr. Haïdara has been honoured as a Knight of the National Order of Mali.

Musa Oluwaseyi Hambolu

Dr. Musa Oluwaseyi Hambolu, 57 years, is an archaeologist and presently teaches in the Department of History and International Relations of Veritas University in Abuja, Nigeria. He recently retired from the services of Nigeria's National Commission for Museums and Monuments where he was the Director of Research Planning and Publications. One of his duties was the supervision of archaeological excavations at proposed World Heritage Sites, and participation in stakeholders meetings. Dr. Hambolu continues to participate in research projects in archaeology, ethnography and culture history as a private researcher.



Marion Hammerl



Marion Hammerl is one of the co-founders of the Global Nature Fund (GNF) and the international Living Lakes Network. Since summer 2002 she has been GNF's President (honorary position). Ms. Hammerl is an economist, and has been active in environmental protection for 25

years. Together with Spanish environmentalists, she founded Fundación Global Nature España in 1994, was its honorary president until 2014, and is still active on its Board. Since 1998 she has been the Managing Director of the Lake Constance Foundation, and the coordinator of numerous EU-supported projects. Among others, Marion Hammerl is an expert in sustainable tourism development, land use planning, sustainability management for local authorities, environmental management systems, management of water resources and the integration of biodiversity into labels and standards for the economic sector.

Matthew Hatchwell

Matthew Hatchwell is based in the UK as the head of the Wildlife Conservation Society Europe. Previously, Matthew directed the WCS programme in Madagascar and the WCS office in Brazzaville,

Congo, where he helped establish Nouabale-Ndoki National Park and co-managed, with government counterparts, a capacity-building programme for protected area managers nationally. In Madagascar, he was instrumental in the creation of Masoala and Sahamalaza/Iles Radama National Parks, and completed the Masoala NP Management Plan in 1998. His current focus includes the World Heritage Convention as a framework to strengthen protected area conservation, and managing the impacts of extractive industry on biodiversity. He is a co-founder of the African Natural World Heritage Sites Support Network.



Saskia Hüneke

Saskia Hüneke was born in 1953 in Greifswald, Germany. In 1980 she graduated in Art History in Leipzig, and has since been the Curator of the Sculpture Collection of the Prussian Palaces and Gardens Berlin-Brandenburg, which have been combined in a Foundation since 1997. In 1988/1989 Saskia Hüneke took part in the struggle for the preservation of the baroque city of Potsdam. Since 1990 she has been committed to the preservation of the Berlin-Potsdam cultural landscape in voluntary political functions, partly through ARGUS Potsdam, partly as a city councilor for the Alliance90/Green Party. Ms. Hüneke has published on the history of the sculpture collection, matters of monument conservation, and memorial architectures such as the reconstructed city palace / parliament building in Potsdam or the Garrison Church, as well as about how to manage the cultural landscape in Potsdam.



Marcela Jaramillo Contreras

Marcela Jaramillo Contreras (1978) has more than 10 years of work experience in community involvement with cultural heritage protection in Colombia. She has assisted with World Heritage nominations and works to educate and empower communities to participate in cultural

heritage processes, including the engagement of children with cultural heritage in areas of social conflict. Marcela has brought to bear her skills in positions with the Ministry for Culture of Colombia, and the Mayor's Office of Bogotá. In addition to several certificates in heritage safeguarding and mitigation strategies, she has a Master's degree in World Heritage and Cultural Projects from Turin University in Italy, a Master's in Political Science from Andes Uni-

versity in Bogotá, Colombia, and a Bachelor's in Philosophy from the National University also in Bogotá. She is currently a lecturer at Javeriana University in Colombia.




Aleksandra Kapetanović

Aleksandra Kapetanović is a conservation architect, one of the founders and coordinator of the cultural heritage sector of the non-governmental organisation EXPEDITIO - Center for Sustainable Spatial Development (www.expeditio.org) based in Kotor, Montenegro. She graduated from

the Faculty of Architecture at Belgrade University, Serbia, and finished a postgraduate course on Architectural Conservation Studies at AINova in the Slovak Republic and a Master in New Technologies for Valorisation and Management of Mediterranean Heritage in Italy. Through the work in the NGO sector since 1997 she has gained experience in different cross-disciplinary activities related to cultural heritage such as research and studies, projects in architecture and restoration, management plans, and working with local populations. Her personal work focus is cultural landscape and public participation in cultural heritage protection.

Wilson K. Kipkazi

Wilson Kipsang Kipkazi is the Executive Director of the Endorois Welfare Council, a representative body formed in 1995 by the Endorois community and an organisation that has long been involved in working to improve respect for the rights of the Endorois in the management of their ancestral lands, including the area of Lake Bogoria, now incorporated into the Kenya Lakes System World Heritage Site. Besides Lake Bogoria, the Endorois Welfare Council is active in various other fields such as education, community and economic development, gender mainstreaming, fundraising and inter-tribal conflict management and peace-building. Mr. Kipkazi has also been the chairman of the National Council of NGOs in Kenya since 2014.



Mikhail Kreindlin

Mikhail Kreindlin (1970) is a biologist and lawyer. He serves as Protected Areas Campaign Coordinator with Greenpeace Russia, and has been involved in work with World Natural Heritage since 2001.

Noëlle Kümpel

Dr. Noëlle Kümpel is Policy Programme Manager at the Zoological Society of London (ZSL). She has 16 years of conservation, research, project management and policy experience, including five years working in the field in Africa and Asia, specialising in tropical forest conservation. Following interdisciplinary research with ZSL's Institute of Zoology, Imperial College London and University College London on bushmeat hunting in West and Central Africa, Noëlle co-managed ZSL's Africa Programme for over six years, including at various World Heritage sites. In her current role, she bridges science, conservation and policy. She recently led ZSL's review of extractives and natural World Heritage sites and the joint NGO statement calling for no-go and no-impact policies for natural World Heritage sites, and represents ZSL in the newly-formed African Natural World Heritage Sites Support Network.



Geoff Law

Geoff Law has spent much of his life protecting forests in Tasmania and has been awarded membership to the Order of Australia for his work as a conservationist. Advocacy is his specialty, and his efforts resulted in the inscription of the Tasmanian Wilderness on the World Heritage List in

1982. He has worked as advisor to Goldman Prize recipient Bob Brown. His experiences in conservation and advocacy at the Franklin and lower Gordon Rivers in Tasmania can be found in his memoir *The River Runs Free*, published in 2008. He has authored and published several other texts about his conservation work and has received research grants to study forests inscribed on the World Heritage List in Japan, Slovakia, and the USA. Currently, he works as a consultant for the Wilderness Society on World Heritage issues and is enrolled in a research project at the University of Tasmania.



Martin Lenk

Martin Lenk, born 1970 in Germany, studied geography (minors in landscape ecology & Slavic studies) at the Universities of Greifswald (Germany), Irkutsk (Russia), Almaty (Kazakhstan) and Seville (Spain). He was involved in the preparation of the WH nomination of "Saryarka – Steppe and

Lakes of Northern Kazakhstan". After working for the International Office for Migration (IOM) in Nakhchivan (Azerbaijan), he is



currently a development expert with the Agency for Statistics of Tajikistan. Martin is a member of the German Society for Nature Conservation (NABU) and World Heritage Watch.



Igor Lutsenko

Igor Lutsenko currently is a member of the Ukrainian Parliament and serves in a committee that works to counter and prevent corruption. During an uprising in January 2014, he was arrested and tortured for protesting against the corrupted law enforcement system in the Ukraine, and was interviewed about his experience by *The Guardian*. He has been an activist for many years and has been working hard since 2007 to protect Kyiv's historic buildings and spaces through the civic initiative known as *Save Old Kyiv*. A man of many trades, Igor has extensive experience as a journalist and editor, as well as positions as a private entrepreneur and adviser to the Ukrainian Ministry of Economics. He holds a Bachelor's in Economics and a Master's in Banking and Finance.

Elena Minchenok

Born in St. Petersburg (Leningrad) in 1983, Elena Minchenok graduated from St. Petersburg State University as a Slavist. She was a co-founder of the NGO "Living City" (2006), one of the most influential civic organizations of the 2000's in

St. Petersburg. In 2007 she joined the Russian National Heritage Preservation Society, and currently is a project manager within the organization. In 2009 she became a member of ICOMOS, and in 2011-2012 was editor, author and translator of a bilingual book "Saint Petersburg: Heritage at Risk", a project that involved an international team of contributing authors. Currently she develops a project of bilateral conferences between the St. Petersburg heritage preservation expert community and the one of the WHS Val di Noto (Sicily) in collaboration with CUNES (Coordinamento Città UNESCO Sicilia), ICOMOS St. Petersburg and the Likhachev Foundation.

Günter Mitlacher

Günter Mitlacher holds a Diploma in Geography (1981) and started his professional career in 1982 with the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation. He then joined the German Ministry for Environment,



followed by a 7-year period as executive director of NABU (Birdlife Germany) and 15 years as nature conservation consultant. Since 2009 he has been with WWF Germany, where he is responsible for international and European biodiversity policy.

Yulia Naberezhnaya

Yulia Naberezhnaya was born in Sochi, Russia, and has been actively working there most of her life. She studied ecology and rational nature management at the International University for Ecology and Political Science in Moscow and is interested in different perspectives of natural heritage and protected areas. Currently she is the Deputy Coordinator of the NGO Environmental Watch on the Northern Caucasus, an organization she has been with since 1998. An active member of the Sochi branch of the Russian Geographic Society since 1995, she is a member of the Expert Group for the Committee for Tourism and Ecology within the Sochi City Assembly. As an external expert she is often asked to provide environmental expertise by the Ministry for Nature of Krasnodar Region. Since 2015 she is also Deputy Chair of the Coordinating Environmental Council under the Mayor of Sochi.



Countries Water Utilities Association (ACWUA) in Jordan and as a Consultant for the German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) Water Programme in Palestine. He holds a master's degree in Environmental Sciences from the University of Cologne as well as a master's degree in Integrated Water Resources Management from the University of Jordan jointly with Cologne University of Applied Sciences. EcoPeace is a unique organization that brings together Jordanian, Palestinian, and Israeli environmentalists in order to protect the shared environmental heritage of the region and thus create the necessary conditions for lasting peace.

Max Ooft

Max Ooft is currently a Policy Officer at the Bureau of the Association of Indigenous Village Leaders in Suriname. He has a Doctorandus degree in Medical Sciences from the Anton de Kom University of Suriname and is pursuing Law Studies in the same university. Early in his career, he was a journalist and editor for a national newspaper, and served as the first General Director of the National Institute for Environment and Development in Suriname. From 2002 to 2008 he was UNDP Assistant Resident Representative and Programme Specialist for Democratic Governance in Suriname. Since 1992, Max Ooft has worked on Indigenous Peoples' rights for various indigenous peoples' organizations at national, regional and international level. The UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, the UN Development Programme (UNDP) and UNESCO have all sought Mr. Ooft's consultation.



Jürgen Nimptsch

Jürgen Nimptsch (1954) studied German Philology and Sports at the University of Bonn and started a career as a teacher in secondary education in 1975 before he was elected Lord Mayor of Bonn as a candidate for the Social Democratic Party in 2009. Throughout his professional life, Mr. Nimptsch has been engaged for educational policies in various honorary functions with the Teachers' Union, the Chamber for Industry and Commerce of Bonn, and the municipal committees of Bonn and Troisdorf. Mr. Nimptsch is well-known to be committed to his local culture by being a hobby actor, a singer and a carnivalist. During his term in office, which ended in 2015, he managed the completion of Bonn's new World Convention Center.

Mohammed T. Obidallah

Mohammed T. Obidallah is Manager of the flagship project, the Good Water Neighbours Project (GWN), at the Bethlehem Office of EcoPeace – Friends of the Earth Middle East. Previously, he worked as Director of Communications at the Arab



Christiane Paulus



Dr. Christiane Paulus (1961) is the Head of the Directorate for Nature Conservation in the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety. In this capacity, she is responsible for natural World Heritage Sites in Germany, and she is also the President of the German National Committee for UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere Program. Dr. Paulus received her PhD in biology from the University of Bonn in 1991. She joined the Federal Ministry for the Environment in 1992 where she served in various divisions related to habitat protection, climate change, international conventions, biotechnology and nature conservation before she was promoted to her present position in 2014.


Konstantina Pehlivanova



Konstantina Pehlivanova began her career by earning a diploma in Architecture from the University of Bulgaria, with additional training in the US and France, and has received several awards for her work, most recently the PLOVDIV Award for cultural merits in the field of Architecture. Ms. Pehlivanova is a member of ICOMOS, of the Chamber of Architects in Bulgaria, and of Heritage BG, a young architects' initiative to stimulate public and professional debate and undertake legislative changes in the field of heritage preservation. She has actively contributed to cultural heritage preservation during her time at Cultural Heritage Without Borders in Albania, and through designing architectural projects for the conservation of monuments in Bulgaria. Her efforts with the Cosmos Cinema Collective contributed to the nomination of the city of Plovdiv to be the European Capital of Culture in 2019.

From 1998-1999 he worked as a free-lancer, and in 1999 began working as an architect in the Metropolitan Municipality of Diyarbakir. From 2005 to 2009 he was engaged in the "Initiative to Keep Hasankeyf Alive". From 2007 until 2013 he was the chairperson for the chamber of architects of Diyarbakir in many civil society campaigns and activities. He has been involved in preparing the WH nomination of Diyarbakir Fortress and Hevsel Gardens as spokesperson of the Advisory Board.

Andrey Petrov



Andrey Petrov (1958) has a PhD in geography, and has been the World Heritage Campaign Coordinator of Greenpeace Russia since 2005.

Dana Phelps

Dana Phelps (1985) is a PhD Candidate in the Archaeology track of the Department of Anthropology at Stanford University, California, and a Research Associate with the Stanford Program on Human Rights. She holds an MA in Cultural Heritage Studies from University College London, as well as a BA in Art History & Archaeology from the American University of Rome. Since 2010 she has been active in World Heritage and civil society projects, including as an intern at the UNESCO World Heritage Center (2011) and as a consultant for several NGOs working at the intersection of heritage and development, including the Butrint Foundation, Gjirokastra Conservation and Development Organization (now Gjirokastra Foundation), and the Albanian-American Development Fund. Her PhD research looks at the effects of World Heritage and national heritage mobilization projects on minority groups in the Balkans.



Necati Pirinççioğlu



Necati Pirinççioğlu was born in Derik in the Province of Mardin, Turkey in 1975. He finished primary and secondary education in Derik, and high school in Diyarbakir, then studied at the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture of Dicle University in Diyarbakir, and graduated from the Department of Architecture in 1998.

From 1998-1999 he worked as a free-lancer, and in 1999 began working as an architect in the Metropolitan Municipality of Diyarbakir. From 2005 to 2009 he was engaged in the "Initiative to Keep Hasankeyf Alive". From 2007 until 2013 he was the chairperson for the chamber of architects of Diyarbakir in many civil society campaigns and activities. He has been involved in preparing the WH nomination of Diyarbakir Fortress and Hevsel Gardens as spokesperson of the Advisory Board.

Stefaan Poortman



Stefaan Poortman is the Executive Director of the Global Heritage Fund (GHF), an organization aimed at sustainably preserving cultural heritage sites in danger in developing countries. He has been with the GHF since 2005 and is also a member of its Board of Trustees. He is on the Board of Directors of the Tayrona Foundation for Archaeological and Environmental Research in Colombia.

At the World Resources Institute, Stefaan worked with the Climate and Energy Project developing voluntary accounting and reporting programs for corporate greenhouse gas emissions in Mexico, India, the Philippines, and South Africa. These experiences and others have given him more than 17 years of experience with international non-profit organizations. He holds an MA with Honors in Economics from the University of Edinburgh.

Sneška Quaedvlieg-Mihailović



Sneška Quaedvlieg-Mihailović has been the Secretary General of Europa Nostra, the Voice of Cultural Heritage in Europe, since 2000. She comes from Belgrade (former Yugoslavia/Serbia) where she obtained a degree in International Law. Having obtained a post-graduate degree in European Law and Politics at Nancy (France), she worked for the European Commission and the European Economic and Social Commit-

tee in Brussels and then for the European Commission Delegation in Belgrade before joining the staff of Europa Nostra in 1992. She has contributed to many European and international committees and networks, most recently to the "European Heritage Alliance 3.3." and the "New Narrative for Europe". She also cooperates regularly and closely with the EU Institutions, the Council of Europe and UNESCO on matters related to heritage and culture.

Holger Rescher

Dr. Holger Rescher is a trained art historian and business economist, and he combines these talents well through his work as the Head of Division for Monument Conservation Science, an economic business with the Deutsche Stiftung Denkmalschutz (German Foundation for Monument Protection). This organization is the largest private initiative for monument protection in Germany and works on around 450 restoration projects each year. Previously, Dr. Rescher held the position of CEO for the German branch of Europa Nostra, and before that he was in charge of public relations with the German Association for Housing, Urban Construction and Spatial Planning in Berlin/Brussels, and worked at the German TV News Agency.



Robert Rode

Robert Rode, MA, is a researcher whose interests include theories of culture and heritage, cultural approaches to globalization, as well as global institutions. Currently, he is the manager of the BTU Graduate Research School and he teaches in the MA programme World Heritage Studies. His doctoral dissertation project focuses on the impact of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples on heritage conservation practices. He has presented papers on indigenous peoples' sacred natural sites, the influence of epistemic communities on heritage values, and intangible cultural heritage in Germany, Finland, France and the Netherlands. Prior to his current position, he studied sociology, political science and non-profit-management in Berlin, Madrid, and Melbourne. In his previous positions he worked with charitable foundations in Madrid and the European Commission in Brussels.



Giyasettin Sayan

Giyasettin Sayan was born in 1950 in the Kurdish city of Haskoy in Turkey. After finishing school, he came to study business adminis-

tration and political science in Berlin where he graduated in 1984.



From 1985 to 1998 he was a social consultant at the Social Workers' Welfare Association Berlin, and from 1995 to 2012 a member of the Berlin House of Representatives for the party "Die Linke" (The Left), including member of the Culture Committee and the Presidium. During that time he became well-known for taking a stand against anti-semitism among Muslims and for denouncing Turkey's denial to admit the Armenian Genocide. After his time as an MP he founded the "Kurdish Society for the United Nations" with Kurdish and German friends, and became its president.

Thomas M. Schmitt



Prof. Dr. Thomas M. Schmitt is a Human Geographer and obtained his PhD from the Technische Universität München in 2002. His doctoral thesis, about mosque conflicts in Germany, focused on fundamental aspects of conflicts surrounding religious symbols in the public space.

After professional posts in NGOs and in a cultural studies research cluster on "Local Action in Africa within the Context of Global Influences" at the University of Bayreuth, he habilitated with "Cultural Governance. On the Cultural Geography of the UNESCO World Heritage Regime" at the University of Bonn's Department of Geography in 2009. From 2010 to 2012 he was on the scientific staff of the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity where he worked on the interdisciplinary research project on "Diversity and Contact" ("Divcon"). He now teaches at the University of Erlangen.

Viktoria N. Sharakhmatova

Dr. Viktoria N. Sharakhmatova graduated from the Russian Academy of Foreign Trade of the Ministry of the Russian Federation, and holds a PhD in Economics. She is a board member and consultant of the Russian Association for Indigenous Peoples of the North (Kamchatka region, Russia), as well as an Associate Professor of "Economics and Management" at the Kamchatka State Technical University.



Ms. Sharakhmatova has been studying problems related to the socio-economic development of the indigenous peoples of the North since 1996, with a special interest in the economic evalua-

tion of traditional indigenous land, the development of the means of production, property relations, distribution of exchange, the distinct characteristics of consumption of the People of the North, the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples of the North and the co-management of natural resources.

Dmitriy Shevchenko



Dmitriy Shevchenko is the Deputy Coordinator and press secretary of “Environmental Watch on the Northern Caucasus”. He was born and raised in Kazakhstan, and graduated from the Faculty of Management and Psychology of Kuban State University in Krasnodar in 2003. From 2004 – 2009 he worked in different mass media as a journalist. In 2009

he participated in the Founding Conference of the Association of Environmental Journalists of the Journalists Union of Russia, and was elected as member of its Council. Dmitriy continues to take part in many environmental protection activities in Russia and the Northern Caucasus. In 2011 he wrote a guidebook called “How to Organize and Conduct an Environmental Campaign”.

Yevgeniy Simonov



Yevgeniy Simonov for two decades has been bridging transboundary gaps in conservation work between Russia and China, Europe, the US and CIS. He completed a Doctorate in Conservation at China’s Northeast Forestry University and focuses on transboundary environmental

issues in the Amur River and Lake Baikal basins as well as impacts of Chinese overseas investment. Supported by the UNECE Water Convention, he studies water management and climate adaptation at the Dauria International Protected Area. For his work on the Sino-Russian-Mongolian Amur River Basin, Eugene received the Whitley Award for the “Keeping Rivers Wild and Free” Initiative in 2013. He is also a Coordinator of the Rivers without Boundaries International Coalition (RwB) for the conservation of aquatic environment and local riverine livelihoods.

Michael Strecker

Michael Strecker has been trained as a geographer in Germany and Canada, and his work focuses on regional planning, education for sustainable development, preventive care for cultural heritage, and inter-religious dialogue. He co-founded the NGO DenkmalWacht Brandenburg und Berlin e.V., modeled after the Dutch



levels of jurisdiction in order to safeguard cultural landscapes.

“Monumentenwacht”, and its umbrella network BAUDID.de on federal level, who all work to proactively protect cultural heritage in Brandenburg and Berlin. Mr. Strecker also keeps relations with Future of Religious Heritage (FRH-Europe.org) and other NGOs all over Germany and Europe, lending his skills to a number of groups at all

Stsiapan Stureika



Dr. Stsiapan Stureika is a Belarusian cultural anthropologist and lecturer at the European Humanities University (Vilnius). His primal research interest is theory of architectural heritage conservation and civil engagement into conservation projects. Since 2012 he has been co-working with the Belarusian committee of ICOMOS, and is a member of the organization. In 2014 he has conducted research for the project “Restoration of Belarusian Castles as Cultural and Social Project” which includes an independent monitoring of the government program “Castles of Belarus”. In 2013 he completed a research project, “The concept of “architectural heritage” in the postmodern era: a comparative anthropological study of two regions in Ukraine and Belarus”.

Manana Tevzadze



Manana Tevzadze has been the chairperson of the Georgian National Committee of the Blue Shield since 2012 and is an active member of ICOMOS Georgia where she implements public awareness activities, and engages in civil activism for Georgia’s cultural heritage. An MA graduate in World Heritage Studies from BTU Cottbus, she is currently doing PhD research on the topic of architectural reconstructions at the University of Kassel. She also holds a History and Theory of Art degree from Tbilisi State University. Her ten-year professional experience ranges from the public sector to non-governmental organizations, the private sector and academia, including international consultancies for Norway and the EC. Ms. Tevzadze was one of the leaders of the campaign “Save Bagrati Cathedral” in 2009, and participated actively in the protest campaign against the destruction of the Sakdrisi Ancient Gold Mine in 2014.

Michael Turner

Professor Michael Turner (1941) is the UNESCO Chairholder in Urban Design and Conservation Studies and heads the Research and Innovation Authority at the Bezalel Academy of Arts and Design, Jerusalem. In parallel, since 1983 he has a private practice with works in architecture, conservation and urbanism. In research he is involved in urban sustainability, heritage, social inclusion and urban spaces. He is a member of many professional bodies, and has served UNESCO in various capacities. Prof. Turner was born in the United Kingdom, studied at the Bartlett School of Architecture in London, and immigrated to Israel in 1965. He spent two decades working in the public sector, first at the Interior Ministry and later for the City of Jerusalem as director of its municipal planning department, and he has been the chairman of Israel's World Heritage Committee from 2001–2011.



Petko Tzvetkov



Petko Tzvetkov, age 43 years, is an ecologist and environmental activist. He is a project manager with the Bulgarian Biodiversity Foundation (IUCN member), which is part of the For the Nature Coalition of NGOs and citizen groups in Bulgaria, and board member of the European Green Belt Association. Since the year 2000, he has been involved in campaigning for the preservation of Pirin NP and WH Site but also in the preparation of the Pirin NP Management Plan (2004).

Maritta von Bieberstein Koch-Weser

Dr. Maritta R. von Bieberstein Koch-Weser is the founder and president of Earth3000, an organization for environment and sustainable development. Since November 2003 she has also been CEO of the „Global Exchange for Social Investment – GEXSI“. Maritta Koch-Weser was Director-General of the World Conservation Union (IUCN) from 1999-2000, and serves on the board of WWF Germany. From 1980-1998, she was instrumental in the development of environmental and social projects and policies at the World Bank, most recently as „Director for Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development / Latin America & the Caribbean Region“. Maritta Koch-




Weser has studied Social Sciences and conducted research in Brazil. In 1975, she received her doctorate at the University of Bonn. From 1976-1979 she taught anthropology at George Washington University in Washington DC.

Susanne von der Heide



Prof. Dr. Susanne von der Heide is a cultural scientist and conservator. From 1988 to 1995 she was curator of education at the Museum of East Asian Art in Cologne. Until 2001 she worked at the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and in the Department of Cultural Heritage in Paris. Since 2001 she has been director of HimalAsia Foundation, which is active in the Himalayan regions. Von der Heide is Professor of Cultural Management and Heritage Studies at the University of Hyderabad and the Kathmandu University in Nepal, where she founded the International Graduate Program 'Landscape Management and Heritage Studies'. Furthermore, she has worked as a book editor, produced exhibitions and directed five films about the Himalayas. For a program to conserve biodiversity in the Himalayan region she was awarded the SEED Award by the United Nations in 2005.

Hellmut von Laer



Hellmut von Laer is a German lawyer and industry consultant with an extensive professional background. His experiences include management of commercial banking, responsibilities for a Federal Independent Commission on finance issues as well as for the Federal Ministry of the Interior in Berlin. Earlier, he worked at the General Secretariat of the European Commission in Brussels and as a Personal Advisor in the Parliament of Lower Saxony. He is the founder of "Yes2gaslicht.berlin", a citizens' initiative for the preservation of the world's largest gaslight ensemble and published on this potential Cultural World Heritage in the "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung".

List of Participants

The UNESCO World Heritage and The Role of Civil Society
Gustav Stresemann Institute, Bonn, Germany, 26-27 June 2015

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Country	Email
Ali	Usman	ICAHM	Italy	usali@iuav.it
Conti	Alfredo	ICOMOS	Argentina	alfredo.conti@icomos.org
Bach	Anna Elisabeth	Sowa Rigpa Foundation	Germany	stiftungsowarigpa@posteo.de
Badman	Tim	IUCN	Switzerland	tim.badman@iucn.org
Bailey	Michael	The Wilderness Society	Australia	vica.bayley@wilderness.org.au
Bandarin	Francesco	Associazione Nazionale Centri Storico-Artistici	Italy	f.bandarin@gmail.com
Belokurova	Elena	Centre for German and European Studies	Russia	
Bertagnin	Mauro	University of Udine / Craterre	Italy	maurobertagnin@africah.org
Bitar	Kamal	Program Specialist	Bahrain	k.bitar@arcwh.org
Bolomey	Nicole		Switzerland	n.bolomey@icloud.com
Bouchenaki	Mounir	Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage	Bahrain	mounir.bouchenaki@gmail.com
Buckley	Kristal	Deakin University	Australia	kristal.buckley@deakin.edu.au
Burt	Samantha	Department of the Environment	Australia	samantha.burt@environment.gov.au
Butler	Sana	Transformative Tourism Development Group	USA	sana.butler@gmail.com
Cameron	Christina	University of Montreal	Canada	christina.cameron@umontreal.ca
Castillo Mena	Alicia	Complutense University of Madrid	Spain	alicia.castillo@ghis.ucm.es
Chamberlain	Luke	The Wilderness Society	Australia	luke_chambo@hotmail.com
Day	Jon	Greenpeace Australia	Australia	jon.day@outlook.com.au
de Azevedo	Pimpim	Tibet Heritage Fund	Hongkong	pemamarpo@yahoo.com.hk
Dharmiasih	Wiwik	Yayasan Konservasi Sawah Bali	Indonesia	wiwikd@gmail.com
Disko	Stefan	International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs	Denmark	stdisko@yahoo.de
Doempke	Stephan	World Heritage Watch	Germany	contact@world-heritage-watch.org
Dontcova	Anna	BTU Cottbus	Germany	dontsovaa@gmail.com
Echter	Claus-Peter	Europa Nostra	Germany	cpechter@gmx.de
Engels	Barbara	German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation	Germany	barbara.engels@bfn.de
Falley-Rothkopf	Elke	Institute for Ecology and Action Anthropology	Germany	elke@infoe.de
Fernandez	Humberto	Conservación Humana	Mexico	huiricuta@yahoo.es
Gangler	Anette	University of Stuttgart	Germany	isbaga@si.uni-stuttgart.de
Geering	Corinne	University of Giessen	Germany	corinne.geering@gcsc.uni-giessen.de
George	Melissa	Indigenous Advisory Community Department of the Environment	Australia	pandanus_mg1@bigpond.com
Gilberto	Francesca	Politecnico di Torino	Italy	francesca.gilberto@polito.it
Glagla	Daniela	Rosa Luxemburg Foundation	Germany	D.Glagla@gmx.de
Gotzmann	Inge	Bund für Heimat und Umwelt	Germany	inge.gotzmann@bhu.de
Gräbener	Uli Frank	WWF Germany	Germany	uli.graebener@wwf.de

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Country	Email
Haidara	Abdel Kader	Sauvegarde et Valorisation des Manuscrits pour la Défense de la Culture Islamique	Mali	haidara_manuscrits@yahoo.fr
Hambolu	Musa Oluwaseyi	Veritas University Abuja	Nigeria	seyibolu@gmail.com
Hammerl	Marion	Global Nature Fund	Germany	marion.hammerl@bodensee-stiftung.org
Hatchwell	Matthew	Wildlife Conservation Society	United Kingdom	mhatchwell@wcs.org
Hofstetter	Martin	Greenpeace	Germany	martin.hofstetter@greenpeace.de
Holly	Ricarda	German Association of Restorers e.V.	Germany	praesidium.holly@restauratoren.de
Hüneke	Saskia	Argus e.V.	Germany	s.hueneke@spsg.de
Immel	Marion	World Heritage Watch	Germany	marionimmel@world-heritage-watch.org
Jacobson	Matthew	Pew Charitable Trust	USA	mjacobson@pewtrusts.org
Jaeger	Tilman	Advisor to IUCN World Heritage Programme	Brazil	tilman.jaeger@alumni.utoronto.ca
Jaramillo Contreras	Marcela		Columbia	marcela.jaramillocontreras@gmail.com
Kabir	Solaiman	World Heritage Watch	Germany	
Kapetanović	Aleksandra	Expeditio	Montenegro	sandra@expeditio.org
Karagianni	Eleni-Ioanna	BTU Cottbus	Germany	eleanna1751@gmail.com
Kipkazi	Wilson K.	Endorois Welfare Council	Kenya	kipkaziwk@gmail.com
Kiss	Judith	German-Russian Exchange	Germany	judith.kiss@austausch.org
Kormos	Cyril	IUCN / WILD	USA	cyril@wild.org
Kreindlin	Mikhail	Greenpeace Russia	Russia	mihail.kreindlin@greenpeace.org
Krueger	Britta	German Society for International Cooperation	Germany	britta.krueger@giz.de
Kümpel	Noëlle	Zoological Society of London	United Kingdom	noelle.kumpel@zsl.org
Lain	Christine	IUCN	Netherlands	tina.lain@iucn.nl
Larsen	Peter	University of Lucerne	Schweiz	peter.larsen@unilu.ch
Law	Geoff	The Wilderness Society	Australia	geoff.law144@gmail.com
Lenk	Martin	World Heritage Watch	Germany	lenk@uni-greifswald.de
Leonhardt	Christian	German Association of Restorers e.V.	Germany	info@restauratoren.de
Lutsenko	Igor	Save Old Kiev	Ukraine	ilutsenko@gmail.com
Magin	Georgina	Fauna & Flora International	United Kingdom	rrf@fauna-flora.org
Marigat	Samuel	Endorois Welfare Council	Kenya	smarigat@yahoo.com
Mentesidou	Eleni	BTU Cottbus	Germany	eleni.mentesidou@gmail.com
Minchenok	Elena	Living City	Russia	e.minchenok@gmail.com
Mitlacher	Günter	WWF Germany	Germany	guenter.mitlacher@wwf.de
Mochizuki	Terumi	Objection to moving the oyster restaurant to near "The Atomic Bomb Dome"	Japan	mochizuki.t@sky.bbexcite.jp
Muddle	Cherry	Australian Marine Conservation Society	Australia	cherrymuddle@amcs.org.au
Murai	Mizuki	IUCN	United Kingdom	mizuki.murai@iucn.org
Naberezhnaya	Yulia	Environmental Watch on North Caucasus	Russia	tangla8@gmail.com
Neugebauer	Carola	RWTH Aachen	Germany	c.s.neugebauer@gmx.de
Nimptsch	Jürgen	Lord Mayor of Bonn	Germany	buer@juergen-nimptsch.de
Obidallah	Mohammed T.	EcoPeace	Palestine	Mohammed@foeme.org
Ochsendorf	Anne	BMUB	Germany	Anne.Ochsendorf@bmub.bund.de
Onial	Malvika	Wildlife Institute of India	India	malvika@wii.gov.in
Ooft	Max	Association of Indigenous Village Leaders in Suriname	Suriname	ooftmax@sr.net
Osipova	Elena	IUCN	Switzerland	elena.osipova@iucn.org

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Country	Email
Overmans	Christiane	City Council of Bonn	Germany	stadtrat@christiane-overmans.de
Oxley	Stephen	Department of the Environment	Australia	stephen.oxley@environment.gov.au
Panegyres	Jessica	Greenpeace Australia	Australia	jessica.panegyres@greenpeace.org
Paulus	Christiane	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety	Germany	Christiane.Paulus@bmub.bund.de
Pehlivanova	Konstantina	Chamber of Architects in Bulgaria	Bulgaria	konstantina.pehlivanova@gmail.com
Petrov	Andrey	Greenpeace Russia	Russia	andrey.petrov@greenpeace.org
Phelps	Dana	Stanford University	United States	dana.f.phelps@gmail.com
Pirinçioğlu	Necati	Diyarbakır Consultative Committee	Turkey	necatipirinccioglu@hotmail.com
Plotnikov	Mikhail	Environmental Watch on North Caucasus	Russia	westcaucasus@gmail.com
Poortman	Stefaan	Global Heritage Fund	USA	spoortman@globalheritagefund.org
Quaedvlieg-Mihailović	Sneška	Europa Nostra	Netherlands	sqm@europanostra.org
Rehfeld	Silvan	World Heritage Watch	Germany	silvanrehfeld@world-heritage-watch.org
Rescher	Holger	German Foundation for Monument Conservation	Germany	rescher@denkmalschutz.de
Rode	Robert	BTU Cottbus	Germany	robert.rode@b-tu.de
Romanowski	Anja	German Association of Restorers e.V.	Germany	info@restauratoren.de
Sainty	Rocky	The Wilderness Society	Australia	rockysainty@gmail.com
Sayan	Giyasettin	Kurdish Society for the United Nations	Germany	sayan@linksfraktion-berlin.de
Schauerte	Hans	World Heritage Watch	Germany	film@southernrain.de
Schep	Charlotte	Wildlife Conservation Society	Australia	lottie.schep@gmail.com
Schmitt	Thomas M.	University of Augsburg	Germany	thomas.schmitt@geo.uni-augsburg.de
Sharakhmatova	Victoria	Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Kamchatka Region	Russia	vsharakhmatova@gmail.com
Simonov	Yevgeniy	Rivers Without Boundaries	Russia / China	esimonovster@gmail.com
Strecker	Michael	Denk-mal-an-Berlin e.V.	Germany	Michael.Strecker@gmx.info
Stureika	Stsiapan	European Humanities University, Vilnius	Belarus	stsiapan.stureika@ehu.lt
Tennhardt	Thomas	NABU e.V.	Germany	Thomas.Tennhardt@nabu.de
Tevzadze	Manana	Blue Shield Georgia	Georgia	mtevezadze@hotmail.com
Tumer	Aslihan	WWF International	Turkey	atumer@wwfint.org
Turner	Michael	Bezalel Academy	Israel	unescochair@bezalel.ac.il
Tzvetkov	Petko	Bulgarian Biodiversity Foundation	Bulgaria	petko.tzvetkov@biodiversity.bg
Vidargas	Francisco	Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia	Mexico	francisco.vidargas@gmail.com
von Bieberstein Koch-Weser	Maritta	Earth3000	Germany	mkochweser@earth3000.org
von der Heide	Susanne	HimalAsia Foundation	Germany	himalasia@wlink.com.np
von Laer	Hans-Hellmut	Denk mal an Berlin e.V., yes2gaslicht.berlin	Germany	hellmutvonlaer@gmx.de
von Wrede	Kristina		Germany	Kristina.wrede@gmail.com
Warren	Lochlan	European Shoah Legacy Institute	Czech Republic	lochlan.warren@shoahlegacy.org
Wulf	Friedrich	Pro Natura - Friends of the Earth Switzerland	Germany	Friedrich.Wulf@pronatura.ch
Zaotschnaja	Tjan	Society for Threatened Peoples	Germany	tjanzaotschnaja@web.de
Zverev	Aleksandr	Center for German and European Studies	Russia	alehandrep@gmail.com

Volunteers

Astari	Asanti	Volunteer	Indonesia	asanti_astari@yahoo.com
Gondecki	Philip	Volunteer	Germany	p.gondecki@googlemail.com
Hotchkiss	Courtney	Volunteer	USA	chotchk1@gmail.com
Krasilnikova	Nadezhda	Volunteer	Russia	nakrasilnikova@gmail.com
Stöhr	Juliane	Volunteer	Germany	juliane.stoehr@giz.de
Weßling	Leyla	Interpreter	Germany	
Zinnatova	Zarina	Volunteer	Kazakhstan	zarina.zinnatova@gmail.com

Conference Program

The UNESCO World Heritage and The Role of Civil Society
Gustav Stresemann Institute, Bonn, Germany, 26-27 June 2015

Friday, June 26, 2015 (Day 1)

- 9:00 **Opening Ceremony**
Welcome by Stephan Doempke, World Heritage Watch
Welcome by Mr. Jürgen Nimptsch, Lord Mayor of Bonn
Address by Dr. Christiane Paulus, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety
Address by Ms. Daniela Glagla, Rosa Luxemburg Foundation
- 9:30 **Keynote Address**
Stephan Doempke (World Heritage Watch)
- 9:45 **Presentations for Special Occasion**
Dr. Abdel Kader Haïdara (Sauvegarde et Valorisation des Manuscrits pour la Défense de la Culture Islamique)
Why We Could Save the Libraries of Timbouctou (Mali) (translated from the French)
- 10:15 Dr. Susanne von der Heide (HimAlasia)
Saving Cultural Heritage in Bhaktapur (Nepal) after the Earthquake
- 10:30 **Opening Session: Strategies for the Involvement of Civil Society in the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention**
Prof. Francesco Bandarin (on behalf of Kishore Rao, Director, World Heritage Center)
Alberto Conti, Vice-President, International Council for Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS)
Tim Badman, Director World Heritage Program, International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN)
Max Ooft, Association of Indigenous Village Leaders in Suriname (VIDS)
- 11:30 *Coffee break*
- 12:00 **Theme I: NGO Contributions to the Safeguarding of the World Heritage**
- Session 1. Natural Heritage NGOs**
Moderator: Dr. Maritta von Bieberstein Koch-Weser (Earth 3000)
- Andrey Petrov / Mikhail Kreindlin (Greenpeace Russia)
Russian Natural World Heritage Properties Facing Threats from Development Projects
- Dr. Noëlle Kümpel (Zoological Society of London)
Safeguarding Natural WH Sites from Extractive Activities
- Marion Hammerl (Global Nature Fund)
The Living Lakes Initiative and Natural World Heritage – Lessons Learnt from Wetland Conservation
- Uli Frank Gräbener (WWF Germany)
WWF's Engagement in Natural World Heritage Sites - A Global Overview
- Matthew Hatchwell (Wildlife Conservation Society)
Addressing the Threats to Natural World Heritage Properties: Findings from a WCS Comparative Assessment of 32 Natural World Heritage Sites Worldwide
- 13:30 *Lunch*

15:00 Parallel Sessions**Theme II: Assessing the Situation of Selected World Heritage Properties****Session 2. Natural Properties***Moderator: Günter Mitlacher (WWF Germany)*

Geoff Law (Wilderness Society Australia)

The Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) – a Case for Long-lasting Civil Society Involvement in Protecting World Heritage

Yevgeniy Simonov (Rivers Without Boundaries)

Lake Baikal World Heritage (Russia) under Threat from the Development of Hydropower in Mongolia

Martin Lenk (World Heritage Watch)

The Tajik National Park – Conservation Challenges in a Low-Income Country (Tajikistan)

Julia Naberezhnaya (Environmental Watch on North Caucasus)

After the Olympics: Developments in the Western Caucasus World Heritage (Russia)

Petko Tzvetkov (Bulgarian Biodiversity Foundation)

Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) Affected by Ski Development

Session 3. Cultural Landscapes*Moderator: Dr. Inge Gotzmann (Bund Heimat und Umwelt)*

Dr. Inge Gotzmann (Bund Heimat und Umwelt)

Civil Society Involvement in the Nomination of two World Heritage Cultural Landscapes in Germany

Mohammed T. Obidallah (EcoPeace)

The Struggle of Civil Society to Save the Roman Irrigation System and the Terraced Cultural Landscape of Battir (Palestine)

Aleksandra Kapetanović (Expeditio)

Management Problems and Civil Society Experience in the Bay of Kotor (Montenegro)

Dr. Musa Oluwaseyi Hambolu (Veritas University, Abuja)

Engendering Civil Society Mobilisation in four Cultural Landscapes of Nigeria

Wiwik Dharmiasih (Project Kalpa and Yayasan Konservasi Sawah Bali)

Increasing Management Effectiveness through Strengthening of Local Communities in Subak Cultural Landscape of Bali (Indonesia)

Session 4. Sites*Moderator: Prof. Michael Turner (Bezalel Academy, Jerusalem)*

Michael Strecker and Hans-Hellmut von Laer (Denk-mal-an-Berlin e.V.)

Civil Society vs. the City of Berlin: Struggling to Save the Historic Gas Lanterns in the Streets of Berlin (Germany)

Saskia Hüneke (Argus e.V.)

Management Problems of the Castles and Gardens of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany), and Civil Society Experience

Dana Phelps (Stanford University)

Archeological Sites, Local Population, and Power Structures: The Case of Butrint (Albania)

Francesca Giliberto / Nicole de Togni (Politecnico di Torino)

Ivrea (Italy): A Historical Urban Landscape between Conservation and Urban Transformation through Involvement of the Population

Necati Pirinççioğlu (Diyarbakir Consultative Committee)

The Role of Civil Society in the UNESCO Application Process of Diyarbakir (Turkey)

Theme III: Civil Society, States Parties and UNESCO**Session 5. Participation of Civil Society and the World Heritage***Moderator: Stephan Dömpke (World Heritage Watch)*

Stephan Doempke (World Heritage Watch)

Participation of Civil Society in the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention: The Challenges Ahead

Dr. Thomas M. Schmitt (University of Augsburg)

Difficulties of Interaction and Communication in the World Heritage System

Robert Rode (Brandenburg Technical University at Cottbus)

Natural Sacred Sites, the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and Bio-cultural Approaches in Nature Conservation

Dr. Alicia Castillo Mena (Complutense University of Madrid)

Results of the Second International Conference on Best Practices in World Heritage: People and Communities

Marcela Jaramillo Contreras (Bogotá)

The Cultural Heritage Watchers: A Success Story from Columbia

16:30 *Coffee break*17:00 **Continuation of Parallel Sessions 2-5**

Discussion and elaboration of recommendations and resolutions

18:00 *Dinner*20:00 **Reception by the City of Bonn****Saturday, June 27, 2015 (Day 2)**9:00 **Theme I: NGO Contributions to the Safeguarding of the World Heritage (ctd.)****Session 6. Cultural Heritage NGOs***Moderator: Prof. Dr. Mounir Bouchenaki (Arab Regional Center for World Heritage)*

Stefaan Poortman: Global Heritage Fund

Sneška Quaedvlieg-Mihailovič: Europa Nostra

Giyasettin Sayan: Kurdish Society for the United Nations

Dr. Holger Rescher: German Foundation for Monument Conservation

Discussion and elaboration of recommendations and resolutions

10:30 *Coffee break*11:00 **Parallel Sessions****Theme II: Assessing the Situation of Selected World Heritage Properties (ctd.)****Session 7. Historic Cities***Moderator: Prof. Francesco Bandarin (Associazione Nazionale Centri Storico-Artistici)*

Elena Minchenok (Living City)

Management Problems of the Historic Center of St. Petersburg (Russia)

Pimpim de Azevedo (Tibet Heritage Fund)

Lessons from the Attempt to Conserve Architectural Heritage of Lhasa Old Town, 1993-2000 (China)

Dr. Anette Gangler (University of Stuttgart)

The Work of Civil Society for the Reconstruction of the Historic Center of Aleppo (Syria)

Sana Butler (TTDG)

The Transformative Tourism Development Group and Mozambique Island (Mozambique)

Discussion and elaboration of recommendations and resolutions

Session 8. Monuments

Moderator: Dr. Christina Cameron (University of Montreal)

Manana Tevzadze (Blue Shield Georgia National Committee)

The Role of Civil Society in the Safeguarding of Georgia's 3 World Heritage Sites: Challenges and Outcomes

Konstantina Pehlivanova

Authenticity or Touristic Reconstruction in the Run-up to a European Capital of Culture in Plovdiv (Bulgaria)

Igor Lutsenko (Save Old Kiev)

Intensive Urban Development Surrounding the Cathedral of St. Soşa of Kiev (Ukraine)

Dr. Stsiapan Stureika (European Humanities University, Vilnius)

Ownership Problems and Appropriation of Cultural Heritage by the Local Population on the Example of Mir and Nesvizh Castles (Belarus)

Discussion and elaboration of recommendations and resolutions

Theme III: Civil Society, States Parties and UNESCO**Session 9. The World Heritage Convention and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples**

Moderator: Elke Falley-Rothkopf (Institute for Ecology and Action Anthropology)

Victoria N. Sharakhmatova (Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North; Kamchatka Region)

Joint Management Mechanisms of Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples of the North in Protected Areas such as "Volcanoes of Kamchatka" (Russia)

Nicole Bolomey

Traditional Communities in World Heritage Properties - the Case of Ngorongoro (Tanzania)

Wilson K. Kipkazi (Endorois Welfare Council)

Nature Conservation, Indigenous Land Rights and the Role of UNESCO: The Case of the Kenya Lakes System

Humberto Fernandez (Conservación Humana)

Cooperation of an NGO with an Indigenous Nation for the Nomination of the Huichol Pilgrimage Routes (Mexico)

Discussion and elaboration of recommendations and resolutions

13:00 *Lunch*

14:30 **Building a Civil Society Network on World Heritage**

16:00 *Coffee break / Distribution of draft resolutions*

16:30 **Closing Plenary: Adoption of Resolutions**

18:00 *Dinner*

Sunday, June 28, 2015 (Day 3)**All-day excursions:**

7:15 - 18:00 Upper Middle Rhine Valley World Heritage Site

9:00 - 18:00 Aachen Cathedral and Cologne Cathedral World Heritage Sites

We thank the following donors for supporting travel costs in whole or in part, for themselves or other speakers:

Dr. Abdel Kader Haïdara
Manana Tevzadze
Humberto Fernandez



Elena Minchenok
Igor Lutsenko
Dr. Stsiapan Stureika
Victoria N. Sharakhmatova



Alfredo Conti



Pimpim de Azevedo



Tim Badman



with support from Tsewang Norbu

Max Ooft



Elke Falley-Rothkopf



Dr. Noëlle Kümpel



Wilson K. Kipkazi



Uli Frank Gräbener
Günter Mitlacher



Michael Strecker
Hans-Hellmut von Laer



Marion Hammerl



Mounir Bouchenaki



Matthew Hatchwell



Stefaan Poortman



Geoff Law



Dr. Maritta von Bieberstein Koch-Weser



Yevgeniy Simonov



Andrey Petrov / Mikhail Kreindlin



Giyasettin Sayan



Dr. Musa Oluwaseyi Hambolu



Necati Pirinçcioğlu



Sneška Quaedvlieg-Mihailović



Prof. Michael Turner
Robert Rode



Francesco Bandarin himself
Saskia Hüneke herself

“The conference was brilliant!”

Andry Petrov, World Heritage Campaign Coordinator, Greenpeace Russia

“It was a pleasure to join the WHW Conference in Bonn, and congratulations for the event. Look forward to keeping in good touch!”

Tim Badman, Director World Heritage Program, International Union for the Conservation of Nature

“Thank you for your leadership. I think this is a wonderful moment and look forward to further building and reinforcing the voice of civil society.”

Dr. Christina Cameron, Canada Research Chair on Built Heritage, University of Montreal

“I must take this opportunity of thanking you for your incredible efforts and tenacity in creating a forum for civil society in all its forms. The emergence of WHW was evident by the interventions made during the World Heritage Committee and I hope that the tradition will be continued in the future.”

Prof. Michael Turner, UNESCO Chair in Urban Design and Conservation Studies, Belazel Academy, Jerusalem



sponsored by



Deutsche
Bundesstiftung Umwelt

www.dbu.de



Federal Ministry for the
Environment, Nature Conservation,
Building and Nuclear Safety



Foundation for International Dialogue
of the Savings Bank in Bonn



Centre for German and European Studies
St. Petersburg State University