

Dmitry Vorobyev

UNESCO World Cultural Heritage Site
Management in European Cities

WP 2011-11

Bielefeld University



St. Petersburg State University



**Centre for German and
European Studies (CGES)**



CGES Working Papers series includes publication of materials prepared within different activities of the Center for German and European Studies both in St. Petersburg and in Germany: The CGES supports educational programmes, research and scientific dialogues. In accordance with the CGES mission, the Working Papers are dedicated to the interdisciplinary studies of different aspects of German and European societies.

The paper is written in the framework of the research project "European Cities in the Globalization Times: Dealing with Cultural and Historical Heritage" in the framework of the CGES research area "Sub-National Regionalism in Europe and Russia".

Dmitry Vorobyev is a researcher at the Centre for Independent Social Research (St. Petersburg)

Contact: moxabat@gmail.com



INTRODUCTION	3
EUROPEAN HISTORIC CITIES – UNESCO WORLD CULTURAL HERITAGE SITES	6
WORLD HERITAGE SITES MANAGEMENT	10
CHANGING THE BASIC DOCUMENTS OF UNESCO WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE NOMINEES	14
THE APPLICATIONS FOR THE ST. PETERSBURG SITE	19
INTERNATIONAL NETWORKS OF THE HISTORIC CITIES	21
CONCLUSION	23

Introduction

In the last ten years probably the most actively discussed issues in St. Petersburg became the problems of urban development, its connection with the necessity to modernize old infrastructure while at the same time preserving its valuable architectural heritage, and providing a comfort both for tourists and inhabitants. How is the new construction of new buildings possible in the historical centre of the city? How to develop the urban infrastructure in a historic city? These are the questions which are asked not only in St. Petersburg, but in many historical cities around the world; and especially in Europe, where their historical character and status are very important for the policies of both urban development and preservation of historical and cultural heritage. That is why European experiences are especially important when we try to find ways of how St. Petersburg can answer its contemporary challenges.

In this paper, cases of some of the most prominent examples of such cities are analyzed, with each city's historical city centre included in the list of UNESCO world historical heritage sites. In spite of a high level of diversity in regard to the cities' date of inclusion into the UNESCO list, the population, size of the protected areas and other parameters, these cities have some common problems which they all face and should solve. These problems are connected with the quality and efficiency of the protection of historical and cultural heritage, with the development of the urban and tourist infrastructure, the management of the World Heritage site, and its accordance with contemporary requirements and standards defined by the UNESCO institutions for all the sites included into their lists. Therefore, the management of the UNESCO sites became very important and topical, both on the international and national level of different countries. But it became even more important on the level of the cities themselves, because they should really care both about their urban problems and correspondence with the international standards.

As an answer to this need, which was very clearly recognized by the urban experts' community in St. Petersburg during the last ten years, this paper is dedicated to the question about the contemporary discussions and reformation of the management systems for the UNESCO World Historical Heritage sites which are initiated by UNESCO institutions, but implemented by national and local authorities. This practical orientation of the paper is explained by the high level of demand for such information which has been expressed by the St. Petersburg experts' community.

The objective of the paper is to review the European state of affairs with the management of major historic towns and cities, which are a part of UNESCO World Heritage. The Convention for the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage was adopted by UNESCO in 1972. Today, this status is important for preservation of historical and natural heritage as well as for the development of tourism and promotion of cultural values. The World Cultural and Natural Heritage sites are located in 151 countries and the convention was ratified by 187 countries. The process of implementation of the Declaration of the World

Heritage continues. This process is as complex as the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol and the other global conventions. The debate about World Heritage sites is not less heated than the debate about the issues of global warming; however, this debate is not recognized by many Russian scientists who are not very interested in the issues of World Heritage protection.

St. Petersburg has the status of a World Heritage Site and thus should implement the appropriate policies for its protection and find the appropriate management measures. St. Petersburg is not the only city that faces protection issues; there are many other historic cities and towns in a similar situation. The experience of some European cities with similar status to St. Petersburg which face protection related problems is particularly interesting for us.

In addition, one must be well aware of the decision-making rules of the organization, in case there is a need for cooperation with UNESCO. A preliminary survey of St. Petersburg experts showed that these experts don't have enough information about specific examples and are not aware regarding the procedures that clarify the boundaries of the World Cultural Heritage sites. Also, experts note the lack of general information about the World Heritage management. For example, there is no information regarding the following issues: special heritage management centers in cities and towns and their status, NGOs, public organizations, or city administration departments.

In some cases a city becomes a part of the "World Heritage Sites in Danger" list, such as Dresden for example. In other cases no analysis is made about how the situation develops in the political and legal field. The aim of this series of theses articles is to study how European countries manage World Heritage, study the principles of changes and adjustments of boundaries of heritage sites in Europe, and to identify patterns and trends which can indicate the possible developments of the situation in St. Petersburg.

Of all the variety of World Heritage sites, the major historic cities where either the historic center or a significant part of it is recognized as a cultural heritage site are selected for this review¹. Their main characteristics, primarily the World Heritage management system as well as the World Heritage Committee management requirements, will be considered in this paper.

The sources of this review are the documents and records of UNESCO World Heritage Committee, as well as materials from the International workshop, titled: Managing the World Heritage Sites in European cities, which was held on December 17-18, 2010 in St. Petersburg by the Center for German and European Studies (CGES).

The subject of the study is quite specific and interdisciplinary; it aims to examine the principles of management of historic cities. Many descriptive articles on this issue can be found² in the ICOMOS literature database. Comparative management studies of specific World Heritage sites are also very useful for this

¹ See the list: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_World_Heritage_Sites_in_Europe

² <http://databases.unesco.org/icomos/>

work³. An important study was conducted from 2009 to 2011 - Historic Cities in Development: Keys to Understanding and Taking Action - which investigates a number of special cases. Also, there is a promising project of Denis Bocquet, a researcher from the Institute of France in Dresden⁴. During the workshop called: Public Debate on Urban Renewal in Russia and Europe held in CGES in September 2009, he talked about concepts for protection of monuments and heritage cities (see review on www.cogita.ru⁵).

So, the structure of the paper corresponds with the proclaimed goals and tasks: it reviews firstly the UNESCO list of European historic cities, then analyses the available systems of site management, after which it comes to the especially-important question for St. Petersburg of the possibility to change the site's status, and finally discusses the application of all these experiences and UNESCO regulations for the St. Petersburg case. In such a way, the paper presents an empirical analysis of the practically oriented question, and therefore is to some extent is an example of a policy paper oriented mostly to the expert community in the broader sense.

But aside from the UNESCO regulations, requirements and activities, one of the most important factors for the development of historical cities and management of the World Cultural Heritage sites is an exchange of experiences and technologies between different historical cities and towns in the world. During recent years, many sectoral and thematic networks and organizations were built in order to unite the historical cities. It is interesting and to some extent even paradoxical that in most cases these networks are practically independent from UNESCO institutions, which has only some controlling and observing functions. This is why the most important of such networks and organizations of historical cities and towns are analyzed also in this paper.

In general, although self-organized networks are important for the understanding of contemporary situations regarding the management of historical cities, it is the monitoring of the UNESCO institutions, which gives us the most valuable data about every city and town in regard to their site management and developments. Therefore, the analysis of the UNESCO data allows us to find and characterize the diversity of the forms and systems of each site's management as well as to understand differences in the management systems of different countries and regions of Europe in addition to their tendencies of development due to time.

³ Harrison David and Michael Hitchcock (2005). The Politics of World Heritage: Negotiating Tourism and Conservation. <http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=xPcaVQzso58C>; Aa, Bart J.M. van der. (2005) Preserving the heritage of humanity? Obtaining world heritage status and the impacts of listing. <http://dissertations.ub.rug.nl/faculties/rw/2005/b.j.m.van.der.aa>; Sarah Russeil (2006). Transnational Space, Resource or Constraint for the International Action of the Cities at the end of the 20th Century? Comparative Analysis of the Fabric and the Management of World Heritage in Lyon and in Québec, the doctoral thesis in political science. http://theses.univ-lyon2.fr/documents/lyon2/2006/russeil_s; Ismail Serageldin, Ephim Shluger, Joan Martin-Brown. Historic cities and sacred Sites: cultural roots for urban futures. UNESCO 2001. http://www.unesco.org/ulis/cgi-bin/ulis.pl?catno=122311&set=4D00D1C1_3_153.

⁴ Denis Bocquet, Institut français de Dresde. "Historic Cities and the UNESCO: Concepts and Evolutions", http://latts.cnrs.fr/Site/p_lattsperso.php?id=1457&style=&col=

⁵ <http://www.cogita.ru/analitka/istoricheskie-goroda-v-epohu-globalizacii-peterburg-v-sravnitelnoi-perspektive>

European Historic Cities – UNESCO World Cultural Heritage Sites

Only a small number of cities are considered to be World Cultural Heritage Sites: among the seven hundred UNESCO Cultural Heritage Sites, only a few dozen centers of large cities which have been established in the new era. Other cities have received a status of protected ancient cities or small historic settlements. In other cities, only one or a few selected sites are protected by UNESCO, such as the fortress in Kazan or the Red Square in Moscow. In Paris, for instance, only a part of the river Seine is protected by UNESCO. This fact does not only emphasize the value of historic cities, but also reflects how difficult it is to meet the UNESCO criteria to become a unique World Heritage site.

In Western Europe the historic centers of the following cities are considered to be World Heritage sites: cities of Salzburg (nominated in 1996), Graz (1999,2010) and Vienna (2001) in Austria; Venice (1987), Florence (1982), Naples (1995), Rome and the Vatican (1980, 1990) in Italy; Bern (1983) in Switzerland; Liverpool (2004) and Edinburgh (1995) in Britain, Lyon (1988) and Strasbourg (1988) in France. The old neighborhoods and the fortress of Luxembourg (1994) are also included in the list. In some cities, such as Berlin, Potsdam and Avignon (1995) only several architectural ensembles and parks are nominated to become World Historic Heritage.

In the post-Soviet area mainly capital cities acquired the World Heritage status: Budapest (1987, 2002), Warsaw (1980), Prague (1992), Lviv (1998), and all three Baltic capitals: Riga (1997), Vilnius (1994), and Tallinn (1997). Krakow (1978) and Dubrovnik (1979, 1994) also received the status of Cultural Heritage. In the Russian Federation this status was only acquired by the historic towns of Yaroslavl (2005) and St. Petersburg (1990). Novgorod (1992) received the status as a group of monuments. White stone monuments are protected in Vladimir and Suzdal and the Kremlin and Red Square in Moscow. Tables 1 and 2 show the main characteristics of these cities as UNESCO World Heritage sites.

Table 1. Major European Historic Cities – UNESCO Cultural Heritage Sites⁶

Full Titles of the Cultural Heritage Sites	Acceptance date and status change
Old Town of Bern	1983
Budapest: the Danube, the Castle of Buda hill and Andrassy Avenue	1987/2002
The historic center of Cracow	1978
Old Town of Dubrovnik	1979/1994
Old and new city of Edinburgh	1995
The historic center of Florence	1982
Graz - Historic Centre and Castle Eggenberg	1999
The historic center of Lyon	1988
Liverpool - the city of seafarers and traders	2004
The ensemble of the historic center of Lviv	1998
The historic center of Naples	1995
Historic Monuments of Novgorod and surroundings	1992
The historic center of Prague	1992
The historic center of Riga	1997
The historic center of Rome and the Vatican's possession, enjoying extraterritorial rights, including the church of San Paolo Fuors le Mura	1980/1990
The historic center of Salzburg	1996
Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments	1990
Grand Isle - the historic center of Strasbourg	1988
Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn	1997/2008
Venice and its lagoon	1987
The historic center of Vienna	2001
The historical center of Vilnius	1994
Historic Centre of Warsaw	1980
The historic center of Yaroslavl	2005

⁶ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>

Table 2. The Main Characteristics of European Historic Cities - UNESCO Historic Heritage Sites⁷

Site (city)	Date of admission	Selection Criteria ⁸	Area, hectare	Buffer zone, hectare
Berne	1983	(iii)	84	
Budapest	1987/2002	(ii)(iv)	473	494
Cracow	1978	(iv)	150	1057
Dubrovnik	1979/1994	(i)(iii)(iv)	97	54
Edinburgh	1995	(ii)(iv)		
Florence	1982	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)	505	
Graz	1999	(ii)(iv)		
Lion	1988	(ii)(iv)	427	324
Liverpool	2004	(ii)(iii)(iv)	136	751
Lviv	1998	(ii)(v)	120	2441
Naples	1995	(ii)(iv)		
Novgorod	1992	(ii)(iv)(vi)		
Prague	1992	(ii)(iv)(vi)	866	8963
Riga	1997	(i)(ii)	438	1574
Rome	1980/1990	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)	1485	
Salzburg	1996	(ii)(iv)(vi)	236	467
St.Petersburg	1990	(i)(ii)(iv)(vi)	4000	
Strasbourg	1988	(i)(ii)(iv)	94	
Tallinn	1997/2008	(ii)(iv)	113	2253
Venice	1987	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(v)(vi)		
Vienna	2001	(ii)(iv)(vi)	371	462
Vilnius	1994	(ii)(iv)		
Warsaw	1980	(ii)(vi)	26	
Yaroslavl	2005	(ii)(iv)	110	580

⁷ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>

⁸ i: to represent a masterpiece of human creative genius;
 ii: to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;
 iii: to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;
 iv: to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;
 v: to be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;
 vi: to be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/criteria/>

If, however, some small towns are added to this list, it would become quite long. One of the UNESCO reviews provides information about hundreds of similar sites. Most of the UNESCO sites are city centers, which are located in the Mediterranean (39) and Western (27) parts of Europe. 18 of the protected cities are located in Central and South-Eastern Europe, eight - in the Nordic and Baltic countries, and only five in Eastern Europe, including Russia.

It is not very easy for a historic city to become part of the UNESCO cultural heritage designation. Applications are often rejected for various reasons. This happened, for example, to Warsaw, when the application of 1978 was initially rejected. However, two years later the city center received World Heritage status. The Polish city of Gdansk, which was named by UNESCO the 'Town of Memory and Freedom', submitted its application for the second time in 2005, after its first application was rejected in 1998.

When an application is accepted by UNESCO, the selected site first becomes part of the tentative list. Riga was expecting a final decision to be put on the tentative list for six years after its first application attempt in 1991. Vilnius was waiting for four years after a fiasco in 1990. In April 2010, Dublin was put on the tentative list. Ukraine is awaiting a decision regarding Odessa (2009) and Chernigov (1989), as well as regarding the architectural ensembles of Kiev (2009). Among the historic towns in Russia, Pskov (2002), Yeniseisk (2000), and Irkutsk (1998) are on the list⁹.

The historic centers of many small towns are also expecting UNESCO's final decision. Among these Italian towns and places are the most numerous. In 2006 alone, Italy submitted 37 applications, among which were such historic towns as Bergamo¹⁰, Lucca¹¹, Parma¹², and Pavia u Chartreuse¹³. In the following four years Italy submitted another four applications¹⁴. Italy leads in the number of nominated sites on top of the already 45 World Heritage sites in the country. Jurmala in Latvia has been waiting for a reply since 2005¹⁵ and the historic city center of Santarem in Portugal has been waiting for UNESCO's recognition since 1996¹⁶.

On the contrary, if the preservation of a historic site is in danger or if it loses the characteristics which determined its inscription on the World Heritage list, the site can be removed from the list; but before that, it will be inscribed on the list of World Heritage in Danger. At present 30 different sites are included in this list.

Even though there are only a few examples of Historic Sites in Danger, their examples are extremely revealing. The following cities had been inscribed to the list in Europe: Croatian Dubrovnik (1991-1998), the city of Kotor in

⁹ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/state=ru>

¹⁰ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/331/>

¹¹ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/340/>

¹² <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/1148/>

¹³ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/327/>

¹⁴ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/state=it>

¹⁵ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/395/>

¹⁶ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/562/>

Montenegro (1979-2003), and the city of Butrint in Albania (1997-2005). Another important example is the Cologne Cathedral, which was included in the World Heritage in Danger list in the early 2000s, in response to the risk of its famous view from all across the area being lost after the construction of tall buildings on the River Rhine. After a number of expert meetings, negotiations with the administration and the rejection of high-rise development plans, in 2006 the Cologne Cathedral was withdrawn from the list and consequently completely restored its World Heritage site status¹⁷.

In the entire history of UNESCO, only two sites were excluded from the protection list, as in the case of Dresden, which was expelled in 2009 due to construction of the bridge over the Elbe. The possibility of inscription of certain sites in the in Danger list is discussed at UNESCO annual congresses quite often. However, such possibility is not always taken into account by the cities or towns. For example, in Spanish Seville it was planned to build a 178-meter skyscraper despite the UNESCO protests. The situation is similar to St. Petersburg where it was also planned to build a skyscraper and where its construction project management for a long time refused to pass to UNESCO materials regarding the impact of the skyscraper on the historic city landscape. The author of the project in Seville is an Argentinean architect Cesar Pelli. The organizer of the contest is a local company called Puerta Triana, the owner of the Bank Cajazol. Seville received World Heritage status in 1987 for Seville Cathedral, Seville Alcázar and the Indies Archive¹⁸. Conflicts are also developing in Kiev, Ukraine due to the possible building of a high-rise area around the Sofia Kiev National Park¹⁹.

In Russia, St. Petersburg, Yaroslavl, and Novgorod might lose the status of a cultural heritage site. In Yaroslavl, a new bridge and a road junction are being built at the UNESCO protected area²⁰. In St. Petersburg, plans to build the Okhta Center at Okhtinskaya cape had been a threat for a long time.

To manage these conflicts, as well as to maintain and to ensure the effective World Heritage site management the establishment of a special site management system is required. The sites vary in different countries, and therefore require further study, which is presented in the following section.

World Heritage Sites Management

World Heritage sites require appropriate structures for their management. Different countries have developed their own management practices for such sites that are likely to be associated with the degree of centralization or decentralization of governance in the states, as well as with the degree of state intervention in handling social problems.

¹⁷ <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/periodicreporting/EUR/cycle01/section2/292-summary.pdf>

¹⁸ http://www.archi.ru/foreign/news/news_current.html?nid=3465&fl=1

¹⁹ <http://www.segodnya.ua/news/14136750.html>

²⁰ <http://kp.ru/daily/24401/577822/>

Authorities at the national level are most often responsible for the management of World Heritage sites. In the Mediterranean, for example, almost all objects are managed at the national level. This may be due to the high degree of centralization of government in those states. The situation in the more decentralized countries of Western Europe is different: it is dominated by the local authorities (85%) with approximately equal participation of the administration of national and regional levels (65% and 62%). In some cases, the Site Management System also includes different kinds of religious communities, private organizations, foundations, and associations (as in the Netherlands, Germany, UK).

Some sites, or parts thereof, are managed by independent non-profit organizations²¹. Usually this is not one, but several organizations, which form councils which operate to inform, discuss, and coordinate various interest groups. Half of World Heritage sites are operated by such structures. In the North-Baltic region such structures work in 71% of cases. The joint activity requires special skills to harmonize the attitudes of the participants of the process, so an opinion about clarification of the status and rights of such councils in relation to these structures is often expressed²².

Table 3 provides information on organizations and authorities responsible for managing some of the European Historic Heritage sites. This study is based on information found on the websites of various historic sites and their management bodies, as well as in individual publications on various historic sites.

As shown in Table 3, in most cases there is only one structure responsible for the management of a historic site, it is either the city or town administration, as in the cases of Salzburg, Liverpool, Warsaw, Riga, Vilnius and Yaroslavl, or city or town administration committees, as in Tallinn, Novgorod, St. Petersburg, and Bern. Edinburgh is a special case; a local foundation is managing its historic heritage. The World Heritage site is managed at the national level only in Prague, where a National Institute for Preservation of Monuments is established.

A joint management of historic sites is less common. In Italian cities, the city administration operates only in conjunction with the other institutions. The most complicated system has been adopted in Rome, where a World Heritage site is managed not only by the representatives of the two states - Italy and the Vatican - but also by several other committees and organizations, including a special unit of the Ministry for Cultural Heritage for the sites included in UNESCO list.

²¹ Periodic Report... 2007, p. 60

²² Periodic Report... 2007, p. 60

Table 3. Organizations Responsible for the Management of Historic Heritage²³

Site (city)	Organization
Berne	Bureau des Monuments historiques de la ville de Berne – M. le Conservateur de la ville
Budapest	Budapest Főpolgármesteri Hivatal/The Municipality of Budapest
Cracow	Cracow City Hal
Edinburgh	Edinburgh World Heritage Trust
Florence	Municipality of Florence Assessorato di Cultura Direzione Ufficio Tematico e di Progetto “Cultura”
Liverpool	Liverpool City Council
Naples	Municipality of Naples Manager of the Service Valorisation of the historical city
Novgorod	The Novgorod Regional Committee for Culture, Cinema and Tourism Department of State Control, Protection and Use of Monuments of History and Culture
Prague	National Institute for the Protection and Conservation of Monuments and Sites
Riga	Riga City Council
Rome	Italy: Municipality of Rome; Councilorship for Tourism; “Ufficio Extradipartimentale per le Politiche e la Promozione Internazionale del Turismo e della Moda-Eventi”; Ministry of Cultural Heritage – Office for the World Heritage List UNESCO. Vatican: Secretariat of State; Apostolic Palace V – Vatican City State
Salzburg	Magistrat Salzburg
St.-Petersburg	The Committee of State Control, Use and Protection of Historic and Cultural Monuments of the St-Petersburg Government
Tallinn	Tallinn Cultural Heritage Department
Venice	Municipality of Venezia Central Direction for territory development and mobility Office for Urban Transformation
Vilnius	Vilnius City Municipality
Warsaw	Warsaw City Hall

Table 4 presents information about the complex system of sites management, which includes the additional working groups, coordinating structures, and the sometimes large number of various possible structures, responsible organizations, and bodies. The Table makes the differences in the sites management obvious to the reader. While in some cases the systems are very advanced, in others they are virtually non-existent and may even require initial creation and development. When observing and analyzing the processes with the personnel involved at these organizations, it has been found that there may be up to one-thousand employees working at an organization and hardly anybody bearing any responsibility.

²³ Periodic Reporting (Cycle 1) Section II Summary. <http://whc.unesco.org>

Table 4. Historic Heritage Sites Management System²⁴

Site (city)	Site management/ Organization responsible	Staff
Budapest	Steering group does not exist at this time, but one has been ordered in the 2005 Act of LXXXIX on the Protection of Cultural Heritage. No site manager has been appointed at this time.	20
Cracow	No steering group No site manager/coordinator, but is needed	403
Edinburgh	Steering group set up in 1997. Site manager on full-time basis. Edinburgh World Heritage has a team of eight full-time staff, supported by a part-time finance manager, volunteers and interns.	
Florence	Management by the State Party; under protective legislation. Site manager.	
Liverpool	Local Planning Authority and the Local Highway Authority. English Heritage, Liverpool Vision, Merseytravel, and others. Most of these public bodies are represented on the Liverpool World Heritage Site Bid Core Steering Group.	
Naples	Inter-managerial group was created (with management representatives from the Municipal Planning Department, the Municipal Police Department, the Mobility Department, the Metropolitan Area and Decentralization Office, Economical Promotions, Strategic Planning, SIT Work Planning and the Department of Economic Development) and a series of periodic meetings has commenced with the Monuments and Fine Arts Offices.	1.156
Novgorod	Steering group has been legally set up in 1992. Site manager on full-time basis.	505
Prague	Steering group to be established following up with the establishment of the function of the coordinator in 2006. At present its function is fulfilled partially by the Commission of the Board of the Capital of Prague for the monuments care in the territory of the Capital of Prague.	49
Riga	Steering group: The Council for the Preservation and Development of the Historic Centre of Riga is a public advisory body set up in order to facilitate the process of developing and implementing the physical plan of Riga's Historical Centre.	20
Rome	The responsible national agencies are the Ministry for the Environmental and cultural Heritage (Superintendence for the Archaeological Heritage of Naples and Caserta; Superintendence for the Environmental and Architectural Heritage Of Naples and its Province; Superintendence for the Historic and Artistic Heritage Of Naples and its Province), the Museum of Capodimonte, the Campania Regional Council, the Provincial Council of Naples, and the Town Council of	

²⁴ Periodic Reporting (Cycle 1) Section II Summary. <http://whc.unesco.org>

Site (city)	Site management/ Organization responsible	Staff
	Naples. Collaborating bodies are the Ministries of Environmental Affairs, Education, works, Home Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Tourism and Entertainment, Defense, and Scientific Research, Italia Nostra, Lega Ambiente (Environmental League), and Napoli '99 (Cultural Association for the Promotion Of the Patrimony Of Naples).	
Salzburg	Steering group: the City Mayor for Culture and the head of the Dpt. for Building, Traffic and Urban Planning of the Magistrate of the City of Salzburg as managerially responsible, take care of all kinds of questions affecting the World Heritage site manager on full-time basis.	2
St.-Petersburg	Steering group has been set up legally in 1997. Site manager on full-time basis.	N/A
Tallinn	No steering group. Site manager on full-time basis.	3
Venice	Fachbeirat für Stadtplanung und Stadtgestaltung, Beirat des Altstadtterhaltungsfonds, Amtsführender Stadtrat für Kultur Schutzzonenbeirat, Denkmalbeirat Naturschutzbeirat.	
Vilnius	Steering group: Supervision Council of Vilnius Old Town Renewal Agency was set up to suggest on priorities and principles of implementation of Vilnius Old Town Revitalisation Program. No site manager	19
Warsaw	No steering group. No site manager/coordinator, but needed.	9
Yaroslavl	The Department of Culture and Tourism of the Yaroslavl Oblast Administration; The board of architecture of the Major's Administration of Yaroslavl.	

One of the most important aspects in the management of World Heritage sites is the possibility of change in the basic documents of UNESCO World Heritage Committee nominees. Since the issue was harshly presented to St. Petersburg in 2009-2010, it requires special attention, also in relation to the European practice of Historic Site management.

Changing the Basic Documents of UNESCO World Heritage Committee Nominees

Requirements and recommendations of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee change and therefore they should be considered in progress. UNESCO is not a static organization, especially when it comes to the management of large historic cities.

Historic Heritage management concepts change and regular monitoring of those corrections is very important. The first cycle of monitoring the UNESCO Cultural and Natural Heritage was held in 2005-2006 and the second round, to be held in 2012, is in the process of preparation.

The Committee also receives feedback through regular country reports and town visits - so-called "reactive monitoring". These materials are summarized in the thematic reports of UNESCO World Heritage Committee.

It is important to note that monitoring reports are full of words such as "misunderstanding", "incorrect interpretation" and so on. For example, it is often assumed that the management of a site is only about its legal protection and control, rather than the development of management plans and tourism or the site's general promotion²⁵. A notable example is the World Heritage site management plan developed for Moscow²⁶.

There are significantly large numbers of requests from advisory boards to the monitoring group of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee (2006, Europe) on the following aspects:

- 15 - inscription criteria;
- 10 - statement of significance;
- 88 - new statement of significance;
- 46 - change of the boundaries of a site;
- 65 - change of the buffer zone²⁷.

In order to provide the methodological support to historic site management, the World Heritage Committee officially adopted the Guidelines for Management Planning for Cultural Heritage in 1993. After this, the development of site management planning was included in the inscription application form. However, not all of the World Heritage sites received the status before 1993 and by 2006 only 40% of historic sites had developed their management plans²⁸.

The root of the problem is that there is no common understanding about what exactly should be included in the management planning. Many management plans simply do not meet modern standards; for example, plans from some Western European countries developed between 1960 and 1970. Confusion arises in distinguishing the differences between concepts of a "management plan" and of a "management system". In many cases, when talking about a management plan, people mean the general plan, land use plans or urban development plans²⁹. This happens because of the lack of specific site management structures and financial and human resources. In addition, the management of historic sites is often done by various organizations at the same time, leading to inconsistencies of local regulations and management plans³⁰.

The effectiveness of site management, however, is often assessed at the local level as "very effective", even without management plans, demonstrating that activities are being conducted but without the UNESCO requirements for

²⁵ Periodic Report... 2007, p. 60

²⁶ http://www.ovpm.org/en/news/report_7th_conference_central_and_eastern_europe

²⁷ Periodic Report... 2007, p. 76

²⁸ Periodic Report... 2007, p. 63

²⁹ Periodic Report... 2007, p. 63

³⁰ Periodic Report... 2007, p. 63

transparency and accountability. In Mediterranean cities, for example, 96% of the World Heritage sites consider their management systems regular and effective, despite the fact that only 31% of the sites have management plans³¹. Among other problematic issues is poor quality of maps³².

The “authenticity” and “integrity” of almost a quarter of all European World Heritage sites have been affected by transformation. In Central and Eastern Europe, this process is mostly due to uncontrolled development in the surrounding territories, in particular, the reconstruction of historic town centers, which directly affects the preservation of historic heritage. In Mediterranean countries, the main problem is also development of surrounding territories, as well as changes in traditional uses of the sites and local ways of life. World Heritage sites in Nordic and Baltic countries are affected by population fluctuation, the development of tourism, the construction of buildings and infrastructure. In Western Europe, the main threat to World Heritage sites is a real estate development.

Another problematic issue for most of the World Cultural Heritage sites is the clash of laws protecting historic and cultural sites and local planning regulations, particularly in urban environments. The post-Soviet countries are also experiencing problems connected to the privatization of assets, reduction of state control and the delegation of control and responsibility to local authorities. The role of public and urban development plans is very important when it comes to dealing with such problems³³.

Another important process is the refinement of historic towns’ boundaries. This involves not only with new and modern requirements for mapping information, but also new construction and new approaches towards conservation. In particular, a new buffer zone concept was introduced, establishing specially protected areas of sites. There was a release of UNESCO’s directive on the re-inventory of sites inscribed before the 1990s and as a result, many major cities expanded or clarified their boundaries to adjust their status. Often this process takes a considerable amount of time. For example, Graz was nominated in 1999, applied for re-nomination in 2005, but it was only in 2010 that it was extended by Eggenberg castle.

According to monitoring data, many cities plan to change their Statements of Significance, the primary document describing the value of a heritage site. The same goes for the boundaries of heritage site and, according to data, 23% of boundaries are considered to be “inadequate”. 42% of sites had not created buffer zones by 2006, however, the large number of requests for changing buffer zones suggests the expansion and inclusion of new sites³⁴. It is important to note that often the issue of the buffer zone is only raised in cases of new construction and development of the surrounding areas, or when the visual appearance of a

³¹ Periodic Report... 2007, p. 63

³² Periodic Report... 2007, p. 58

³³ Periodic Report... 2007, p. 57

³⁴ Periodic Report... 2007, p. 57

site is likely to be damaged³⁵.

The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV) is an important document for the World Heritage List. It was introduced in 2005 and is intended to replace the Statements of Significance, which had been introduced in 1998. The document before that was called Justification for Inscription. According to § 155 of Operational Guidelines, SOUV should be developed for all new nominees of the World Heritage List.

To date, a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has not yet been developed for all historic towns and other cultural and natural heritage sites. During their 32th through 34th sessions, the UNESCO World Heritage Committee discussed and adopted SOUVs for Salzburg, Graz, Warsaw, Prague and Krakow (the historic city centre), as well as Liverpool and Berlin (however, only some of the historical area of town is part of the World Heritage). As for other historic towns, according to UNESCO reports presented on the organization's website, SOUVs are being developed but haven't yet been approved.

The SOUV also includes statements of identity and/or safety, the importance of which is constantly emphasized. It is stated, for example, that it is "the main instrument for the preservation of value and the achievement of an acceptable approach for site conservation and management"³⁶.

According to monitoring data, the representatives of the World Heritage Committee recognize "a very strong misinterpretation of UNESCO's terms and concepts, such as for example 'The Statement of Relevance' or 'The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value'. These concepts are adopted by the Convention for the Protection of the World Heritage and are not rooted in national legislation. Consequently, they are often either misunderstood, misinterpreted or completely ignored."³⁷ The same goes for the Statement of Authenticity and/or Integrity³⁸.

Table. 5. Major Events Related to the UNESCO World Heritage Site Status and Characteristics Change³⁹.

Site (city)	Activity (UNESCO guidelines)
Berne	
Budapest	2003 Changes to Names of Existing Properties 2008 Including Andrassy Avenue (Hungary) (2002-2008) 2008 Clarifications of property boundaries and sizes
Krakow	2008 Revision of Statements of Significance and of Statements of Outstanding Universal Value 2008 Clarifications of property boundaries and sizes

³⁵ Periodic Report... 2007, p. 58

³⁶ Periodic Report... 2007, p. 58.

³⁷ Periodic Report... 2007, p. 56.

³⁸ Periodic Report... 2007, p. 58.

³⁹ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>

Site (city)	Activity (UNESCO guidelines)
	2009 Adoption of retrospective Statements of significance and of Outstanding Universal Value 2009 Approves the buffer zone for Krakow's Historic Centre, Poland.
Dubrovnik	1991 Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger 1998 Removals from the List of World Heritage in Danger 2008, 2009 Clarifications of property boundaries and sizes by States Parties in response to the Retrospective Inventory
Edinburgh	2008 Revision of Statements of Significance and Statements Outstanding Universal Value
Florence	
Graz	2006 - Extension of Properties 2010. Approves the extension of the City of Graz - Historic Centre to include Schloss Eggenberg and to become City of Graz - Historic Centre and Schloss Eggenberg, Austria 2010 Statements of Significance and Statements Outstanding Universal Value
Lion	2011 Clarifications of property boundaries and areas by States Parties in response to the Retrospective Inventory
Liverpool	2010 Statements of Significance and Statements Outstanding Universal Value
Lviv	2008 Examination of nominations and minor modifications to the boundaries of natural, mixed and cultural properties
Naples	2011 Cultural Properties - Examination of minor boundary modifications 2011 Clarifications of property boundaries and areas by States Parties in response to the Retrospective Inventory
Novgorod	
Prague	2008 Revision of Statements of Significance and Statements Outstanding Universal Value
Riga	2008 Clarifications of property boundaries and sizes
Rome	2007 Nomination of natural, mixed and cultural properties to the World Heritage list 2009 Clarifications of property boundaries and sizes by States Parties in response to the Retrospective Inventory
St.-Petersburg	
Strasbourg	2007 Nomination of natural, mixed and cultural properties to the World Heritage list
Tallinn	2008 Examination of nominations and minor modifications to the boundaries of natural, mixed and cultural properties Clarifications of property boundaries and sizes
Venice	
Vienna	
Vilnius	2008 Examination of nominations and minor modifications to the boundaries of natural, mixed and cultural properties
Warsaw	2008 Revision of Statements of Significance and of Statements of Outstanding Universal Value 2008 Clarifications of property boundaries and sizes 2009 Adoption of retrospective Statements of significance and of Outstanding Universal Value
Yaroslavl	
Zalsburg	2008 Revision of Statements of Significance and of Statements of Outstanding Universal Value 2008 Clarifications of property boundaries and sizes by states parties in response to the retrospective inventory 2010 Statements of Significance and Statements Outstanding Universal Value

In regard to the general context and recent developments, the situation in St. Petersburg and the city's applications are particularly interesting and revealing.

The Applications for the St. Petersburg Site

There are 24 UNESCO World Heritage Sites in Russia (15 cultural and 9 natural). The case of the Historic Centre of St. Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments is one of the first cases of UNESCO's granting a historic site status to a huge historic and natural territory where hundreds of thousands of people currently live.

Plans to build a high-rise Okhta-center tower (known also in the beginning as Gasprom-City) in St. Petersburg raised UNESCO's concerns⁴⁰. The decision regarding the Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments site stated that "the plans provided by the participating country on January 18th, 2007 and on March 5th, 2007 do not meet the requirements of the Committee, and do not contain distinct boundaries and buffer zones of neither sites, including those in the Leningrad oblast." As a result, the Committee adopted a sanction for the Russian authorities and advised "to stop the project, to obstruct all the issued work permits until all the relevant material is reviewed and a comprehensive assessment of threats to the World Heritage is made"⁴¹.

The decisions of 32nd and 33rd UNESCO meetings expressed concern over the low quality of legislation for the protection of historical heritage as well as for intense building in the historic centre, with the Okhta-center tower project given a special attention. In addition, the lack of a consistent management system of a historic site was noted, as was the absence of regular reports on the condition of a historic site. To avoid this position, at the last UNESCO session, the Russian delegates proposed to conduct re-nomination, as well as to clarify and modify the boundaries of the historic site.

Vera Dementieva (at that time the Head of the Committee on State Protection of Monuments, which is responsible for the preservation of St. Petersburg as a UNESCO World Heritage site) expressed her position in 2010: "We are given two option: one is to conduct the re-nomination, in case we significantly change the boundaries in both directions, and in case of reduction or increase. Another option is to make corrections along the way, without the re-nomination (i.e. conducting change outside of the city centre). "The re-nomination does not lead us to a temporary exclusion from the list. If case of re-nomination we remain under the number 540"⁴².

⁴⁰ Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments.

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/540/threats/>

⁴¹ UNESCO asked to stop building Gazprom Tower. Ros Business Consult (14 July 2007). <http://top.rbc.ru/society/14/07/2007/109180.shtml>. Full text of the decision of the 31st session of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee // New Zealand, 23 June – 2 July 2007.

<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2007/whc07-31com-24e.pdf>

⁴² <http://www.zaks.ru/new/archive/view/72523>

However, even after the plans for construction of Okhta Center were dismissed, St. Petersburg application still failed to satisfy the new requirements. A panel of qualified experts has been preparing proposals for specifying the original set of documents since December 2010. This panel was expected to show in March 2011 some results of its efforts, which are to be discussed at the next UNESCO Summer Meeting⁴³.

In spite of such serious problems, the Russian media often refers to a remark made by Eleonora Mitrofanova, the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to UNESCO and the head of the Russian Delegation at the last UNESCO session, where, when commenting on the situation in St. Petersburg, she said: "As of today, all the current major issues have been solved and the issue of including St. Petersburg in the threatened sites list has never been considered"⁴⁴.

Experts, however, believe that it is impossible to implement the proposed procedure. The re-nomination process takes several years and involves exclusion from the World Heritage site list and the submission of a new application, the subsequent evaluation cycle of which takes at least half a year. For example, "what is written in §165, which refers to the decision of the 34th session of the WHC: 'If the state, which is a party of the Convention wishes to significantly change the boundaries of the historic site included in the World Heritage List, this state must submit a proposal as to obtain a new nomination. This re-nomination must be submitted by February 1st and will be considered in the course of a year and a half evaluation cycle according to the procedures and timetable described in section 168. This applies both for expansion and for reduction of boundaries.' The procedure described in § 168, completes the inclusion of a site in the list. The question is how can something which had not included to the list be excluded from it?"⁴⁵ This quote demonstrates the main argument of opponents of the so-called "re-nomination process".

In other words, St. Petersburg administration puts forth a deliberately hopeless path that leads to the loss of the city's status as a cultural heritage site. The UNESCO experts consider the reluctance of St. Petersburg to prepare and publish in a timely manner the materials proving that the city can match the original Declaration of Outstanding Universal Value as a primary cause of the current situation. However, the situation may develop in an unpredictable way. Many experts expect another manipulative action from the city administration, such as a delay of the process of clarifying the city nomination. The unpredictability of this situation increased in August 2011 with the appointment of a new governor and a new Head of KGIO (Committee for State Control, Use and Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments).

In this situation, we must refer to the current practice and experiences of decision-making in similar UNESCO cultural heritage sites – large cities with a

⁴³ http://saint-petersburg.ru/m/237687/peterburg_esche_god_mozhet_ne_boyatysya_isklyucheniya_iz_spisk.html

⁴⁴ UNESCO canceled St. Petersburg and Gazprom Tower issue . 30.07.2010. <http://www.gazprom-neft.ru/okhta-center/news/?id=1735>

⁴⁵ <http://www.zaks.ru/new/archive/view/72523>

nominated historic center. We must study cases that changed their boundaries and were nominated, as well as the materials on the basis of which the decisions to change the UNESCO status were made. Then there will be a possibility to prepare proposals clarifying St. Petersburg's nomination process.

Many of these and other issues are resolved by historic sites jointly, through various agencies and associations whose activities are aimed at sharing experiences and joint problem solving.

International Networks of the Historic Cities

St. Petersburg may enter a European cities network and start exchanging its experiences in handling various issues and implementing the new historical and cultural heritage management systems. Below is the description of the major associations and societies of historic towns.

One of the most important associations is the Organization of World Heritage Cities⁴⁶, which was founded in 1993. It involves 238 cities where there are World Heritage sites. Among others, it includes the Russian cities of Moscow, Kazan, St. Petersburg and Novgorod. In addition to sharing experiences and regular conferences, the Association conducts general comparative studies; for example, a project on "Historical cities in development: a basis for understanding and action" (2010)⁴⁷.

Another organization is the League of Historical Cities, which brings together 89 cities from 56 countries. It was founded in 1994 after the first conference in Kyoto in 1987. The two networks are actively cooperating after the 8th World Conference of Historical Cities, which was held in Montreal in 2003.

The EU program "Heritage of Europe"⁴⁸ has been in action since 1999 and the European Association of Historic Towns and Regions was formed in the framework of this program. It consists of 30 European countries, and unites about a thousand European towns⁴⁹.

There are organizations such as the International Assembly of Capitals and Cities and Twin Cities International Association (The World Federation of United Cities). Also, there is the International Union of Local Authorities and the International Conference of Mayors for Peace Through Solidarity. In Russia, there is the Russian Union of Historical Cities and Regions⁵⁰.

In addition to these large international organizations, there are also highly specialized networks for conservation and restoration of cultural heritage sites,

⁴⁶ Organization of World Heritage Cities, <http://www.ovpm.org>

⁴⁷ "Historic Cities in Development: Keys for Understanding and Acting"

http://www.ovpm.org/en/compilation_case_studies_conservation_and_management_historic_cities

⁴⁸ Heritage Europe

⁴⁹ <http://www.historic-towns.org/>

⁵⁰ <http://rossigr.narod.ru/ustavdoc/spisok.htm#>

as well as associations of employees and admirers of the city museums⁵¹. There are programs for the protection of historical cities; for example, The World Monuments Watch⁵², which deals with identifying and monitoring sites threatened by destruction.

Of the twenty-two sites listed by organization in the Russian Federation, five are located in St. Petersburg: Palaces in Tsarskoye Selo (1996, 1998), Yelagin Island Palace (1998), the Mendeleev tower – part of the D. I. Mendeleev All-Russian Scientific and Research Institute of Metrology – (2008), and the city sky line (2008).

Historic towns are involved in many joint projects. For example, the project "HerO – Heritage as Opportunity"⁵³ is aimed at creating a network of historic towns and urban landscapes that resolves conflicts related to the current use of the historical landscape and reveals the potential for cultural heritage in activities in the areas of economics, society and culture.

The extensive program is also organized by UNESCO: there are working and research groups, conferences at various levels, including regional. For example, in Winter 2007 St. Petersburg hosted a conference called "Application of Scientific and Technological Achievements in Management and Preservation of Historic Cities Inscribed on the World Heritage List"⁵⁴.

ICOMOS is the UNESCO authorized body on World Heritage⁵⁵ and its regional office in Russia was established only in Spring 2010.

The issue of cultural heritage management system is equally important. St. Petersburg may be the only European city that hasn't yet developed a management plan according to the UNESCO principles – there is no official body that deals with this issue. UNESCO points out that in general, there is no program to promote Russia's cultural and natural heritage. Also, the main document - the Federal Law on Cultural Heritage – doesn't mention UNESCO, therefore there is no official body that deals with World Heritage Sites. There are only a few management bodies of individual historic sites, including Kizhi, Ferapontov Monastery and others. However, there is a need for the establishment of the Directorate under the auspices of the Russian Federation and UNESCO to manage each site. In addition, St. Petersburg as World Heritage site doesn't have its Declaration on the Outstanding Universal Value.

⁵¹ The International Committee for the Collections and Activities of Museums of Cities
<http://www.camoc.icom.museum/index2.php>

⁵² <http://www.wmf.org/>

⁵³ <http://urbact.eu/en/projects/cultural-heritage-city-development/hero/our-project/>

⁵⁴ A Regional Conference for Central and Eastern Europe on "Application of Scientific and Technological Achievements in Management and Preservation of Historic Cities inscribed on the World Heritage List" organized by the World Heritage Centre with the Municipal Authorities of St. Petersburg and the Russian Federation, held in St. Petersburg, Russian Federation (29 January - 3 February 2007).

⁵⁵ <http://www.icomos.org/>, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Council_on_Monuments_and_Sites

Conclusion

The UNESCO World Heritage Committee is working very much for the building of transparent evaluation, control and a site management system. It is based on a unified approach to the sites in different countries and includes many different mechanisms, such as the work of public boards for tourism development, regular monitoring on the basis of the unified indicators system, bringing unique declarations and descriptions of the sites in accordance with the contemporary situation.

One of the main instruments for maintaining the value of historical centers in historical cities is updating the protected areas. This is connected not only to the change of urban landscapes because of contemporary new construction but also to new approaches to protection. Thus a concept of the buffer zone was introduced to create a special protected territory around the sites. These changes have caused the new UNESCO Directive on the necessity of the renewed inventory of the UNESCO sites that were included on the lists from the last twenty years of the 20th century, among which St. Petersburg is.

As demonstrated in this paper, many historical cities are working now on similar problems, but solutions depend on management traditions in these countries. At the same time, the sites can be managed both on national and on local levels; the site managing authority can include representatives of just a couple or dozens and even more organizations. On the other side, constant democratization of European communities requires inclusion of as many organizations from different sectors as possible into the management of the site, as well as into the coordination of their interests, especially taking into account the type of the sites focused on in this paper – the centres of the historical cities.

The next aspect is the relationships between the World Heritage protection system of UNESCO and other organizations working on the similar issues. There are many thematic networks that unite historical cities but, as a rule, work on different problems and practically independently from each other. At the same time, UNESCO is not an umbrella for these organizations; it mostly deals within their own specializing expert networks such as ICOMOS.

It is likely the openness of the information within the networks of the historic cities, regular exchange of experiences of development and protection of the historical heritage sites, and identification and usage of the most effective strategies in this field that will help the historical cities in their work.

Among the others, these issues will be of paramount importance in the upcoming 36th Session of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee, to be held in St. Petersburg on 24 June - 6 July 2012.



ZDES Working Papers

Arbeitspapiere des Zentrums für Deutschland- und Europastudien

Рабочие тетради Центра изучения Германии и Европы

Universität Bielefeld – Fakultät für Soziologie
Postfach 100131 – 33501 Bielefeld – Deutschland

Staatliche Universität St. Petersburg – 7/9 Universitetskaja Nab.
199034 St. Petersburg – Russland

<http://zdes.spb.ru/>

info@zdes.spb.ru