EP

United Nations Environment Programme

MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

12TH Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the
Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea
against Pollution

Monaco, 14-17 November 2001

100 HISTORIC SITES PROGRAMME

EVALUATION REPORT

UNEP
Athens, 2001

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

Meeting of MAP National Focal Points

Monaco, 14-17 November 2001

100 HISTORIC SITES PROGRAMME

EVALUATION REPORT

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PROGRAMME

100 historic coastal sites of common interest for the Mediterranean

100 Historic Sites Programme

EVALUATION REPORT

Michèle Prats Inspector General of Public Works France	**Jellal Abdelkafi** Architect-Landscape Designer DPLG Town Planner IUP Tunisia

Paris - Tunis
13 July 2001

It is not the past itself which dominates us (…) but images of the past. These are often just as highly structured and limiting as myths. Symbolic images and constructions from the past imprint themselves on our feelings, almost like genetic information. Every new era sees itself in its image of its own history or a past borrowed from other cultures. This is where it measures its own identity, its instinctive feeling of having moved forward or backwards. The echoes through which a society attempts to determine the scope, influence and logic of its own voice always come from behind – the mechanisms at play are obviously complex and imbued with confused needs, but are fundamental and ongoing. No society can ignore its past."

George Steiner : In Bluebeard's Castle
Paris, Gallimard, Collection folio/essais, 1973.
(MAP unofficial translation)

The entire history of the Mediterranean ; six to ten millennia of history in a world that is vast in terms of mankind, disjointed, contradictory, and studied to an exaggerated degree by archaeologists and historians, a wealth of knowledge that defies any reasoned synthesis. Truth to tell, the Mediterranean's past is history in successive layers that are as deep as the history of far-away China.
Priority to civilizations.
If one wants to obtain a rapid overall view, a common thread has to be chosen. To select one, it would first be best to study the Mediterranean itself, the Mediterranean of today, trying to find out what is the essence of its life today, of its visible equilibrium, and possibly of its past equilibrium. The answer to these questions is rapid and unequivocal. Over and above its current political divisions, the Mediterranean is three cultural communities, three great and lively civilizations, three cardinal modes of thought, belief, drinking and living … In fact, three monsters always ready to bare their teeth, three personalities with an eternal destiny, which have always existed, or at least for centuries and centuries. Their limits go beyond national boundaries, which are simply a flimsy covering and so volatile!
These civilizations are in fact the only destinies long in existence that can be followed uninterruptedly throughout the eventful moments and incidents of Mediterranean history.

Fernand Braudel: "The Mediterranean", Arts et Métiers Graphiques Exclusivité
Flamarion, November 1986.
(MAP unofficial translation)

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Mediterranean coastal area contains large number of buildings, urban areas, cultural landscapes and archaeological sites of exceptional interest. These appeal to the sense of history and are, for the most part, situated in remarkable natural sites from which they cannot be dissociated. They bear witness to the trade, the rivalry, the alliances and the trends that have helped to shape Mediterranean civilizations. This is not their sole interest and they play an increasingly important role in the cultural and tourism development of the coastal countries. Their future is under threat, however, as a result of neglect, pollution, climate change, but above all the excessively large numbers of tourists and uncontrolled urban development.

Based on this fact, countries parties to the Barcelona Convention adopted a programme entitled "100 Historic Sites", whose Secretariat and activities were entrusted to the *Atelier du Patrimoine* of the city of Marseille.

At their Meeting held in Malta in 1999, the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention asked the Secretariat to evaluate the relevance of the 100 Historic Sites programme and its role in the light of the objectives of MAP Phase II, taking into account as well the work programme of the Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD), and the work carried out by other organizations, and to present all the relevant options and recommendations to the next Meeting of the Contracting Parties.

The MAP Coordinator therefore requested the co-authors of this report, Michéle Prats, Inspector General of Public Works (France) and Jellal Abdelkafi, Architect and Town Planner (Tunisia), to conduct this evaluation, taking into account the mandate of the Mediterranean Action Plan and its institutional status, and to:

1. Assess the results of the Programme, describing its objectives and achievements, as well as its lacunae and its potential value added, in comparison with other activities being carried out;

2. To present the principal potential options for the Contracting Parties and their practical details, in particular:

   - Possible termination of the activity;
   - Refocusing within the framework of MAP's sustainable development activities;
   - Cooperation with existing international activities in the same sphere, including the World Heritage Programme and the Euro-Mediterranean partnership.

   *

PART I : STATUS REPORT

1.   BACKGROUND TO THE PROGRAMME

1.1   The beginning

The "100 Historic Sites" Programme is part of the Mediterranean Action Plan established by the 1976 Barcelona Convention, under which 16 out of the 18 Mediterranean countries, together with the EEC, decided to work together to save the Mediterranean. The Preamble to the Convention underlines the exceptional value of the Mediterranean cultural heritage, as well as the obligation to protect it against the threats of pollution, excessive numbers of tourists and uncontrolled urbanization. The Contracting Parties requested the United Nations Environment Programme to provide the Secretariat and to implement the Convention.

In the Genoa Declaration, in **September 1985**, the Contracting Parties fixed the major objectives to be attained and defined a number of actions to be conducted, including the identification and protection of at least **100 Historic Coastal Sites** of common interest, provided that the list remained open to allow the Contracting Parties to add other appropriate sites.

As can be seen from this linkage, the action comes within the framework of sustainable development.

The Contracting Parties requested the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) to draft the general principles and the criteria for the selection of sites and in **1987** they approved an **initial list of 100 Sites**.

In 1988, the Bureau laid down the general guidelines. It was recommended in particular that the protection of historic sites should be integrated into the planning and management of coastal zones and should not concentrate on the technical aspects of protection. The need to encourage new protection programmes, regional cooperation and additional financing were also mentioned.[1]

At the first meeting of those responsible for historic sites of common Mediterranean interest, held at **Marseille in January 1989**, a document entitled "Guidelines for knowledge, protection, planning and management of historic sites of common Mediterranean interest" was drawn up and put before the participants for approval. They subsequently agreed on a "charter". The need for regional cooperation was again underlined and it was decided to set up a network within the framework of the Mediterranean Action Plan.

---

[1] UNEP/BUR/31.

The municipality of Marseille offered to host the network's Secretariat and the Contracting Parties, meeting in Athens from 3 to 6 October 1989, accepted this offer.[2]

1.2 Institutional structures

MAP's objectives and organization were gradually defined in a pragmatic fashion. From 1987 onwards, in order to avoid too great a dispersion, MAP's activities were redirected towards integrated planning and coastal zone management. In order to attain its objectives, MAP has the support of five Regional Activity Centres : two of these are, in one way or another, involved in the protection of historic sites.

1.2.1. Priority Actions Programme Regional Activity Centre (PAP/RAC)

Following an intergovernmental meeting held in Split in 1977, this Programme was located in Split in 1980. Its aim is to promote rational environmental management through practical action and pilot projects. The Centre also specializes in the legal aspects, the preparation of regulatory documents and planning, as well as being an important training centre. The rapporteurs regret that they did not have the time to visit this Centre in order to obtain a better understanding of its activities. Initially, PAP was responsible for problems related to ancient and historic sites. The Bureau naturally therefore turned to this Centre in 1988 when it was decided to integrate the protection of historic sites and coastal zone planning and management.

For a number of years, PAP/RAC worked on a report on the planning, design and implementation of the rehabilitation of historic sites, based on experience in seven countries. This report was submitted to a meeting held in Barcelona from 22 to 25 October 1990. A seminar on the methodology in Arab institutions was organized in Tripoli in 1991.

1.2.2. Specially-Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC)

This Centre was set up under a Protocol in 1982 for the purpose of creating and managing specially-protected areas and establishing an integrated network of such sites so the problem of cultural sites naturally appeared to be within the scope of this new body. More concerned with nature conservation, ecosystems, biological diversity and protected species, in 1991, SPA/RAC was entrusted with drawing up an inventory of sites of cultural, aesthetic, archaeological, scientific and historic interest.

---

[2] UNEP(OCA)MED.IG.1/2.

1.2.3. Secretariat of the 100 Historic Sites

As recalled above, in 1989, the Secretariat of the 100 Historic Sites of common Mediterranean interest was entrusted to the city of Marseille, which gave the responsibility to the *Atelier du Patrimoine*.

1.2.2.1.Scope of competence of the Atelier du Patrimoine

In 1967, during excavations for the building of a commercial centre in the very heart of Marseille, the construction company was halted by an archaeological find.

The antique Graeco-Roman city was brought to light; the port and the ramparts were uncovered and turned into an archaeological garden of around 1 hectare.

This chance discovery was an embarrassment to the city's technical services, which became aware of their lack of competence in the matter of heritage sites. In order to respond, in 1975, the City Hall gave the architect Daniel Drocourt a special mission. As the task expanded, in 1980 the City Hall established the *Atelier du Patrimoine*, placed under the direct authority of the Secretariat General of the city of Marseille.

The *Atelier du Patrimoine* is composed of around a dozen people, including five architects and one historian, and its task is:

- To draw up an archaeological and architectural atlas of the city;
- To advise the town planning department on matters relating to archaeology and architecture.

In this connection, the *Atelier* examines:

- Applications for building and demolition permits;
- Town planning certificates;
- Public works authorizations for shopfronts and signs;
- Prior studies on rehabilitation, restoration, rebuilding.

The opinions and advice of the *Atelier* allow the municipal authorities to follow a heritage policy whose quality must be underlined.

This quality is the result of the *Atelier*'s professional competence, particularly in the following fields:

- Architectural reports and aesthetic analyses;
- Proposals on rehabilitation/restoration;
- Documentary searches and mapping;

• Preparation of documents to promote public awareness (drawings, models).

What lessons can be learned from this venture, the result of a chance discovery?

Without upsetting the functioning of the municipal authorities, the city of Marseille has given itself an indispensable tool for any heritage policy: pragmatically, the City Hall has responded to the heritage issue by making the *Atelier* autonomous within the Secretariat General, while at the same time using its services as an adviser in the town planning department.

To conduct this policy, in agreement with the State authorities that took part in launching the initiative, the City Hall has chosen a Coordinator who, in addition to his undoubted professional ability, has devoted himself to achieving the cultural aims of the city of Marseille.

1.2.2.2. Support structures for the Atelier du Patrimoine

In order to carry out the *Atelier's* responsibilities as Secretariat of the Programme, the Coordinator has relied on the Director of the Marseille Museum of History, Ms. Myriam Morel-Deledalle, an archaeologist who has taken part in a number of missions and training activities.

A support group under the 1901 Law, the APMHI, has been set up with three people (Daniel Drocourt, Serge Antoine and M.Ho) to act as the identified intermediary for accounting purposes.

1.2.3. The position of the 100 Historic Sites Secretariat within MAP

The task of the *Atelier du Patrimoine* is to act as the Secretariat for the 100 Historic Sites Programme. The Secretariat occupies an independent position within MAP's organizational chart.

The chart below shows the direct link with the Coordinating Unit in Athens.

INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN			
Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development (MCSD)	Meeting of Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention Bureau		National Focal Points
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	UNEP/MAP Coordinating Unit acting as Secretariat (MEDU) Athens		Specialized agencies of the United Nations
MED POL Programme	Blue Plan Regional Activity Centre (BP/RAC) Sophia Antipolis	Priority Actions Programme Regional Activity Centre (PAP/RAC) Split	Specially-Protected Areas Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC) Tunis
Mediterranean Regional Centre for Intervention in Emergencies to combat Marine Pollution (REMPEC) Malta	Clean Production Regional Activity Centre (CP/RAC) Barcelona	Environmental Remote Sensing Regional Activity Centre (ERS/RAC) Palermo	100 Historic Sites Secretariat (APVM) Marseille

In fact, as a result of the background explained above, the institutional relationship was not self-evident.

Despite a coordination meeting held on 10 December 1991, the distribution of responsibilities and the areas of competence of the three Regional Activity Centres were far from clear. The MAP Coordinator was concerned at the risk of confusion and sought the advice of BP/RAC.

Bernard Glass, Director of BP/RAC, made the following proposal:

1.   SPA/RAC would be generally responsible for all activities concerning historic sites and buildings along the Mediterranean coast because of its legal status under the SPA Protocol; it would entrust the APMHI/Marseille with the 100 Sites component and the latter would keep SPA/RAC informed of its activities in this respect.

2.   It could entrust APMHI/Marseille with **technical expertise** missions to

sites that did not come under the 100 Sites component if the former's work plan and resources permit.

3.   PAP/RAC would no longer have any responsibility for historic sites on behalf of MAP. SPA/RAC could, however, ask it to provide training sessions, under MEDU.

4.   The two centres (Marseille and Split) would not act directly in relation to historic sites or buildings other than those entrusted to them.

On 5 March 1993, the Bureau, meeting in Malta, took the following decision, which it will be seen is slightly different, to be put into effect immediately:

Historic sites and buildings

1.   100 Historic Sites (Marseille) is responsible for all the scientific and substantive aspects of MAP's activities relating to historic sites and buildings.

2.   According to the Protocol, SPA/RAC is responsible for the legal aspects. For the purposes of implementation, it will seek scientific support from 100 Historic Sites (Marseille), whenever appropriate.

3.   As has been the case since 1 January 1994, training will be the responsibility of 100 Sites (Marseille), whenever appropriate in cooperation with SPA/RAC, based on the experience gained to date by PAP/RAC.

4.   The 1994/1995 programme should clearly reflect this distribution of responsibilities.

This decision modifies the previous provisions. It has budgetary implications because PAP/RAC loses some of its activities.[3]

1.3   Budget

The rapporteurs were unable to obtain any information on accounts from the *Atelier du Patrimoine*. The only sources available are the MAP Coordinator's progress reports and the reports of the Ordinary Meetings of the Contracting Parties for the period prior to 1994. MAP did, however, provide the UNEP accountant's report dated 18 October 1998.

---

[3] UNEP(OCA)MED IG.3/4 of 15 July 1993.

The Programme had been endorsed by the Contracting Parties at their Meeting held in Athens from 3 to 6 October 1989. According to the report submitted to the 7th Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties in 1991, it would appear that, at a date not determined (we could find no trace of it), a protocol was signed with the *Atelier du Patrimoine* establishing an action plan and a timetable and that US $50,000 was disbursed.[4]

The Programme appears again in the budget estimates for 1992 for an amount of US $ 40,000, which does not appear to have been transferred as the city of Marseille's contribution was estimated to be US $50,000. It would seem that in 1992 MAP faced financial problems as a result of non-payment of some contributions. The 1993 budget mentions US$ 80,000 approved, of which US $40,000 were allocated on 1 July 1993[5], the city of Marseille's contribution still being estimated at US $50,000. We shall return to the budgetary question later because it plays an important role in the Programme's operation.

2.   THE FUNCTIONING OF THE PROJECT

It is somewhat difficult to obtain an accurate picture of the project's functioning in the absence of progress reports. The rapporteurs based themselves on information given in the course of various meetings of working groups, committees and the Contracting Parties, as well as on the final self-assessment report[6] and the letter to the MAP Coordinator from Daniel Drocourt dated 9 March 2001. It must be emphasized that the information provided is not very precise and, in the absence of verifiable data (places, dates, persons contacted, in relation to what mission?), it is difficult to assess the advantages, the scope and the truth.

2.1   Site visits

It seems that the Coordinator of the 100 Sites Programme, sometimes accompanied by his deputy, paid an impressive number of visits to sites. We noted that he was very familiar with the places and the persons responsible for them. In a report in 1993[7], there is mention of a first series of visits to the following sites carried out in 1992 for the purpose of defining the different protection and management needs:

> Naples, Genoa, Ravenna (Italy);
> Algiers and Tipasa (Algeria);
> Tetouan (Morocco);
> Santorini, Epidaurus, Nauplia, Thasos, Samos, Heraklion, Arcadi and Chania (Greece);

---

[4] UNEP(OCA)MED IG.2/Inf.2 du 9 October 1991.
[5] Financial report for the biennium 1992/1993, UNEP(OCA)MED IG.3/Inf.4.
[6] CP/ME/941-94-22 of 12 May 1999.
[7] UNEP(OCA)MED IG.3/Inf.3 of 3 July 1993.

There were also technical visits to:

> Athens, Salonika;
> Istanbul;
> Valetta, Gozo;

(19 sites in all).

A little earlier the same year, another report[8] mentioned **79 sites visited** or assisted (which would correspond to 25 sites a year or two per month), and a **network of 280 site directors set up**.

In 1994 and 1995, the Coordinator visited Sfax three times, Tunis and Sousse twice, Greece, Beirut, Saida and Byblos, Turkey and Italy twice.

2.2   Technical and scientific meetings

The Coordinator apparently took part in most of the meetings of working groups, technical and scientific committees, Regional Activity Centres and the plenary meetings of the MAP Contracting Parties, making a total of around three to four meetings a year. On each occasion, he gave a progress report on the Programme : in the absence of reports describing or reporting on activities, for the most part we have used the reports of these meetings drawn up by the MAP Coordinator and furnished by Daniel Drocourt in order to follow the Programme's progress.

The Coordinator of the 100 Sites also participated in, initiated, or contributed to the organization of a number of technical meetings:

- Authorities responsible for sites, Salonika, June 1992;
- Authorities responsible for sites in the Maghreb, Tunis, June 1993;
- National ICOMOS committees, Marseille, May 1993;
- International Congress on the Degradation of Stone, June 1993;
- Meeting of experts on protection of the underwater archaeological heritage, Bodrum (Turkey), April 1993;
- Meeting of experts on the preparation of plans for permanent protection (in cooperation with Malta), June 1994;
- 1st meeting of 100 Historic Sites Focal Points, October-November 1994.

2.3   Descriptive data sheets

The two main subjects selected for follow-up were: stone degradation and the underwater heritage, including shipwrecks.

---

[8] UNEP(OCA)MED/WG.62.2, 15 March 1993.

In collaboration with officials responsible for sites, the Secretariat of the 100 Historic Sites Programme prepared data sheets.

The data bank is entitled: the situation of stone.

It comprises the following entries:

A. Location of the structure;
B. Description of the site;
C. Date or period of foundation/building;
D. Legal protection;
E. Surroundings;
F. Environment;
G. Type of soil;
H. Visual examination of the building or site;
I. Classification of the building;
J. Type of action – needs;
K. Number of visitors;
L. History of the site, activities and use. Bibliographic information on the site;
M. Remarks/information.

The content of these data sheets is analysed in the assessment (see **3.4** below).

2.4   Technical assistance

The Coordinator of the Programme states that in March 1993[9] he provided 250 people with permanent cooperation in the form of technical advice, help in preparing applications for funding, establishment of protection plans, exchange of information and bibliographies. He also developed a cooperation programme on stone degradation, with the Greek authorities in particular. He apparently helped in the saving of Mnaidra (Malta), contributed to the Tipasa and Algiers Casbah protection plan, the work on draining and restoring Saint Sofia (Istanbul), and the revision of the town planning regulations of Sousse.

An assessment of underwater historical and archaeological sites was initiated. Technical assistance was also given in the context of the coastal areas management programme (Rhodes, Albania, Sfax (1993), Fuka (Egypt)). A special programme was prepared for the conservation of the mediaeval city of Rhodes, which resulted in several reports.

---

[9] UNEP(OCA)MED/WG.66/3 of 9 March 1993.

2.5   Technical reports

The *Atelier du Patrimoine* prepared a number of relevant technical documents and publications, although they were not all elaborated within the Programme's framework.

For example, of the four mentioned in the report cited[10]:

- Brochures on methodology "Diagnostic methods, database and intervention on historic sites" (2 per year);
- Illustrated guide to the Old Port of Marseille;
- Treatment of building facades, in collaboration with ICOMOS,

only one is specific, namely:

- Photogrammetric data on the heritage in seismic regions.

The following titles must also be added:

- Record of the first international meeting of authorities responsible for sites of Mediterranean common interest, Marseille, January 1989;
- Study on the underwater archaeological heritage (French edition, December 1991, English, 1993);
- Preserve or destroy archaeological sites (1994);
- Protection of the underwater archaeological heritage in the Mediterranean (1995);
- Protection of archaeological sites and stone degradation (1995);
- Reports on the mediaeval city of Rhodes;
- Report on the Sfax Medina.

2.6   Training

It was not possible to find out exactly how many trainees went to the *Atelier du Patrimoine* nor the dates. The following information is contained in MAP documents:

- Training course for heritage experts organized in 1991 for Tunisian, Italian, Moroccan, and Yugoslav experts;
- The *Atelier* received Albanian and Tunisian trainees in 1995;
- Training courses for architects from Mediterranean countries on protection and upgrading were organized, without any further details;[11]
- A library was established.

---

[10] UNEP(OCA)MED/IG.3/3 of 15 July 1993.
[11] UNEP(OCA)MED/IG.3/3, UNEP(OCA)MED/WG.66/3.

2.7 Cooperation with other organizations

Cooperation was established with UNESCO. At the meeting of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, held in Paris from 4 to 9 July 1994, the Coordinator presented data sheets on Albania, Arles and Delos. He also took part in the XXIIIrd session of the World Heritage Committee, held in Marrakesh from 29 November to 4 December 1999.

The Committee requested the Secretariat to take note of the proposal that the UNEP/MAP 100 Historic Sites Programme should take part in the regular follow-up exercise so as to make the best use of resources and take advantage of the experience gained.[12]

In the beginning, ICOMOS France and ICOMOS International carried out joint activities with the *Atelier du Patrimoine*, but subsequently no longer wished to continue as their relations with the *Atelier* had deteriorated considerably.

We have not found any trace, however, of cooperation with the European Union or the World Bank, nor of funding proposals under various European Union programmes for the Mediterranean, except for a MED URBS programme for the cities of Sousse and Tripoli in Lebanon.[13]

3. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

3.1 A confused concept

The Genoa Declaration (1987) and the Marseille Charter (1989) are the basic documents governing MAP's heritage-related activities. They call for some comments of form and substance.

3.1.1. The title

In the various documents consulted, it can be seen that the Programme's title often changes, for example:

- 100 Historic Sites of Common Interest along the Coast;
- 100 Historic **Coastal** Sites of Common Interest for the Mediterranean;
- 100 Mediterranean Historic Sites;
- 100 Historic Sites.

The geographical location (coast – coastline) and the common interest seem obvious, but different authors simplify the title : MAP/100 Historic Sites is the usual title.

---

[12] Point IX-11 of the UNESCO Report.
[13] Letter to MEDPOL from Daniel Drocourt, dated 3 April 2000, in preparation for the Malta meeting.

3.1.2. The goal of the action

In the Genoa Declaration, the Contracting Parties put forward **Protection** as the goal of their common action. In many documents, however, it can been seen that this is interpreted differently : for some, it means conservation, for others safeguarding. The Marseille Charter gives priority to conservation (Annex 3, point 6). The question of restoration makes an appearance from time to time.

The origin of this uncertainty as to the Programme's goals is to be found in the following documents (annexed to the Marseille Charter):

> The International Charter on the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (second international congress of architects and technicians of historic monuments, Venice 1964);

> The International Charter for the Protection of Historic Cities (ICOMOS, Toledo, 1986).

These two Charters provide a conceptual framework that places the action in the context of conservation and give priority to the approaches, procedures and methods of archaeologists and architects dealing with historic monuments.

They are no doubt important, but they do not cover all the issues. Specific reference should also have been made to:

- Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (UNESCO, 1972);

- Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding of the Beauty and Character of Landscapes and Sites (UNESCO, 1962);

- Recommendation concerning the Protection, at National Level, of the Cultural and Natural Heritage (UNESCO, 1972);

- Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas (UNESCO, 1976).

3.1.3. The expression "historic site"

MAP uses the expression "historic site" to express the Contracting Parties' interest in the cultural and natural heritage of the Mediterranean coast.

This expression is in conformity with the Marseille Charter (1989), but is inappropriate for two reasons:

- Firstly, heritage is not limited to a single element – the site. Monuments, urban areas (dead cities of archaeological interest, living historic cities), the new cities of the XIXth and XXth centuries, natural areas and landscapes are also included.

  In order to take into account this diversity, UNESCO uses the expression "**property"**, which has the advantage of covering all forms of the cultural and/or natural heritage.

- Secondly, history is not the only criterion that characterizes the property : its aesthetic quality, tradition, art, science, its use, are also referents that help to define the value of the heritage.

3.1.4 The notion of "common interest"

The notion of "common interest" is presented as a fact, although public opinion and even certain political leaders often gloss over contributions from other cultures : awareness of the cultural links that have been forged among Mediterranean countries over millennia, occasionally in sorrow and conflict, and which continue to fertilize them, is essential, together with recognition that these different heritages have become rooted in time, from the earliest days until now. In every country, the general public should be made aware of this.

It was in the name of the past, history, culture and identity that the Contracting Parties undertook to protect the "100 Historic Sites" and, according to the recommendation on the list of sites, the properties selected by the MAP can be placed under the common protection of the coastal countries that have acceded to the programme.[14]

The ways and means for this **common protection** warrant discussion by the Contracting Parties and definition in a special protocol if the demonstration of interest in the cultural and natural heritage is not to remain wishful thinking.

3.1.5 List of properties

- **Quantitative aspect**

The **symbolism of the number "100"** is easy to understand, but it is difficult to follow the logic of the argument set out in the recommendation on the list of sites.

---

[14] Record of the 1st meeting of authorities responsible for historic sites, Marseille, January 1989, Marseille Charter.

The title of the programme refers to "at least 100 Sites", while at the same time point 2 states that MAP's proposals deliberately only concern a limited number of properties.

Point 4, on the other hand, states that the list remains open, indicating that, on the contrary, each site selected must be considered as a bridgehead for action spreading out over the region and involving the largest possible number of satellite sites whose enhancement will be one of the most positive limited effects of the protocol. At no time, however, does **the protocol** mention how the sites, and *a fortiori* the satellite sites, are to be enhanced … We even see the Coordinator of the 100 Sites Programme welcome the increase in the number of sites involved.[15]

Since the Marseille Charter (1989), the list of property selected by MAP has been increased, it now comprises 122[16], of which:

- 58 are also on the World Heritage List, i.e. almost half;
- 96 are cultural property (79 per cent) and 26 are natural and cultural property (21 per cent);
- 88 are archaeological sites (72.1 per cent);
- 4 are historic monuments (3.3 per cent);
- 25 are groups of historic urban buildings (20.5 per cent);
- 5 are groups of historic and traditional urban buildings (4.1 per cent).

This updated list calls for the following comments:

- **Distribution by category**

As the percentage distribution by category shows, most of the properties to be protected are archaeological sites, i.e. dead cities, whereas groups of historic and/or traditional urban buildings, i.e. living cities, only account for less than one quarter.

This distribution implies that the Contracting Parties attach greater importance to sites that are marked by history than to those that are representative of the civilization and cultural practices derived from that history. This is not surprising if one looks at the list of those participating in the Marseille meeting : the majority of the participants were archaeologists.

Analysing the list of property shows the following:

(a) Priority given to historic buildings:
Only 21 per cent of the property is mixed, i.e. the combined work of man and nature. The priority given to historic buildings is surprising given

---

[15] UNEP(OCA)MED/WG 66/8 of 7 May 1993.
[16] See Annex 1. List of historic sites of common interest.

MAP's concern with natural sites and landscapes and man's impact on the environment.

(b)   Interest in large cities:
Barcelona, Genoa, Rome, Trieste, Venice, Istanbul represent some of the property to be protected. These large cities are no doubt fascinating but they are already receive close attention from national and international authorities. Although they raise protection problems – the flooding in Venice for example or the excessive numbers of tourists in Barcelona – a large number of expert studies have already been conducted. Was it necessary to ask MAP to make an additional contribution?

(c)   Famous historic monuments:
The Piazza del Duomo complex in Pisa (the cathedral of Santa Maria Assunta, the baptistery, the monumental cemetery, the Museo delle Sinopie) is cultural property that has been on the World Heritage List since 1987; when the Leaning Tower threatened to collapse, the Italian Government appointed a technical and scientific committee, which recommended that it be closed to visitors (February 1990). In February 1991, in order to take all necessary measures to preserve the monument, an international committee was appointed to take a decision and act; this committee is responsible to the Prime Minister.

Obviously, the Italian Government has taken the measures necessary and the committee has proposed appropriate solutions. Does this site, which is undoubtedly exceptional, also have to be placed under UNEP/MAP's vigilance?

(d)   The Oceanographic Museum in Monaco
This is also on the list as a monument and natural area. The Oceanographic Institute and Museum are famous and the Principality of Monaco has so far demonstrated its capacity to assume the commitments inherent in such a reputation. Was it necessary to include this cultural and natural property on the MAP list?

- **Dual role of international and national entities**

Almost half of the sites on the MAP list are already included in the list drawn up by the World Heritage Committee; this means that the United Nations system plays a dual role in respect of the Mediterranean's cultural and natural property.

Is this necessary?   Is there not overlapping?   Is there not a danger of dispersing resources?

UNESCO, for example, notes that it has few resources to act and also draws attention to

the limits of its action in view of the non-interference clause.[17]

In addition, the World Heritage Committee expresses its concern when its experts note the failure to submit regular reports and the problems encountered in the field[18]. It states that in future priority will have to be given to the ongoing and close examination of the situation in property already listed.

It should perhaps be recalled that the UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Protection, at National Level, of the Cultural and Natural Heritage (Paris 1972) states that: "In conformity with their jurisdictional and legislative requirements, each State should formulate, develop and apply, as far as possible a national policy whose principal aim should be to coordinate and make use of all scientific, technical, cultural and other resources available to secure the effective protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage." (Article 3)

There can be little doubt that the arguments concerning the list of property are confused, not to say demagogic. There is confusion between the operational objectives of such a network, and the concept of renown, whether already effective or sought.

3.1.6 Authenticity and selection criteria

The selection criteria are fixed with reference to:

- The Venice Charter on the conservation and restoration of monuments and sites;

- The Toledo Charter on the protection of historic cities.

In order to be included in the list of 100 Historic Sites on the Mediterranean coast, the criterion of authenticity is strictly imposed:

"If the materials, the decoration of a monument or site, as well as the urban appearance, the spatial arrangement of a city, its relationship to the natural environment and its vocation gained throughout its history over long periods have undergone serious and irreversible changes, irrespective of its historic value and its cultural dimension, the property concerned cannot be proposed."[19]

The demand for authenticity stems from an intellectual aspiration aimed at the purity of form.

---

[17] See Annex 4.3, interview with Ms. Minja Yang, Deputy Director, World Heritage Centre.
[18] UNESCO, World Heritage Committee. Periodic reports: reports on the status of conservation of the global heritage in Arab States.
[19] Record of the 1st meeting of authorities responsible for historic sites, Marseille, January 1989. Marseille Charter.

It is representative of a conservation ideology that can be compared to placing living objects in a museum, whereas urbanization phenomena and the socio-economic mechanisms of tourism or industrialization remind us that the survival of the natural and cultural heritage depends on a negotiated social and political process.

The characteristic of authenticity defined in the Marseille Charter can have no practical scope. On the other hand, in our view, respecting "**the spirit of the place"** is a position that should be promoted, provided that the content and the ways of respecting it are defined.

Five selection criteria were adopted. The site must:

- Be representative of one of the major Mediterranean civilizations;
- Influence the development of architecture and art;
- Play a major role in the history of trans-Mediterranean relations;
- Be indicative of a culture;
- Have been associated with a major event in Mediterranean history.

These criteria are sufficiently broad to be met easily, but they do not allow operational selection because, in addition to being representative of history and culture, another criterion relating to the social and economic role of the heritage in contemporary life appears to us important. A criterion concerning the sustainable development possibilities would also have allowed better selection.

3.1.7   Methodological guidelines

The methodological guidelines have been drawn up for the local authorities and those responsible for sites and their aim is passive protection through legal channels together with active protection through planning, the elaboration of a protection plan that allows the various stakeholders to conduct their action.

This traditional overall objective includes five aspects:

- Knowledge;
- Protection;
- Planning;
- Management;
- Cooperation.

The substance of these is expressed in a particularly confused way. The management chapter especially is inconsistent. The following can be found under the heading "Coordination":

"Safeguard action is multidisciplinary and has broad scope, so a specialized organization with recognized competence should be given the task of coordinating the services and institutions responsible for implementing the safeguard provisions and it should have the necessary trained personnel, as well as technical, administrative and financial resources."

The creation of a specialized organization to carry out coordination is one of the typical proposals that traditionally clashes with the prerogatives of the central authorities responsible for culture, the environment and public works, as well as with the responsibilities of local authorities. As far as managing a safeguard plan is concerned, experience shows that it is preferable to invite the various stakeholders, actors with varying degrees of responsibility, to express their views and to act within the framework of participatory and decentralized planning.

In general, it is better to ask the political authorities to ensure the proper functioning of existing institutions rather than seeking to create new structures. In the area of Mediterranean cooperation, officials responsible for sites, who possess the know-how and experience, should make a **joint effort** in the spheres of **knowledge**, safeguarding and enhancement. For this purpose, officials responsible for the 100 Sites are called on to establish:

- A directory of the Mediterranean heritage;
- A bulletin of 100 Historic Sites;
- An address book of experts;
- A multilingual glossary of archaeological and architectural terms.

Officials responsible for sites are invited to meet every two years and to demonstrate their solidarity, appealing to sponsors to aid the heritage effort.

Reading these guidelines, it might be questioned whether Mediterranean cooperation on its heritage has received sufficient thought. Working together means elaborating an inspiring project that attracts those responsible for sites and gains their support.

As things stand, the 100 Sites programme seems to be a list of property, no doubt of great cultural importance, although each is a special case. To summarize, Mediterranean heritage issues are not clearly defined and it is questionable whether the programme has value added. It is not enough to call for the exchange of knowledge and experience in order to stimulate cooperation, particularly as the majority of those responsible for sites already participate in international professional bodies such as ICOMOS, ICOM, ICROM, etc. or take part in UNESCO or ALESCO programmes.

3.2   Institutional uncertainties

As we have seen above[20], the identification of the project and its place in the structure have been defined gradually. The uncertainty has also had an impact on the status of the programme: in several places, the words 100 Sites/RAC or Marseille Centre 100 Sites appear.[21] MAP has taken a decision on this point: it is not a new Regional Activity Centre, but a special activity hosted by the city of Marseille, although it must naturally be implemented in coordination with the other activities. Despite the 1993 Protocol[22], a degree of ambiguity remains, particularly in the minds of the SPA/RAC staff[23]. Although they acknowledge that they do not have the technical competence to deal with the cultural heritage – which to some extent explains the delay in identifying sites of cultural interest for which the Centre was responsible, in cooperation with the IUCN (whose competence in this regard has not been proven) – they remain convinced that this issue is one of their responsibilities. The ambiguity surrounding this interpretation must be dissipated.

As to Daniel Drocourt's role, here again its definition is vague. Sometimes he is referred to as the Secretary General, another time as the Director or Coordinator, the rapporteurs have chosen the latter title.

The rapporteurs share the view expressed by the French Ministry of the Environment[24], namely, that if it is decided to keep the programme, it should become a Regional Activity Centre. They note in this connection that it has been decided to set up a new RAC in Scanzano for remote sensing.[25]

If internal resources within MAP, for example, fear of increasing the budget, mean that it would be preferable for the programme to remain a special one, the tasks and the terms of cooperation with the other RACs should be spelled out in a protocol containing an agreement for a period of at least four years, i.e. two biennial programme periods, so as to guarantee a minimum of continuity.

3.3   Financing of activities

Activities properly speaking commenced after the Marseille meeting held from 17 to 19 January 1989.

Neither the *Atelier* nor the APMHI kept accounts, so it is difficult to estimate expenditure on the activities or the funds obtained with exactitude. The only reliable accounts were

---

[20] Chapter 3, 3.1, A confused concept, Chapter 1, 1.2, Institutional structures.
[21] UNEP/BUR/38/5, of 10 April 1991.
[22] Chapter 1, 1.2.5., Position within the structure.
[23] See Annex 4.7, Interview with Mr. Adel Hentati.
[24] See Annex 4.9, Interview with Ms. Emmanuelle Leblanc.
[25] UNEP(OCA) MED IG.3/2, of 20 June 1993.

given to the rapporteurs by MAP and concern the 1994, 1995 and 1996 financial years.[26] For the previous period, the activities can be followed by looking at the Coordinator's statements. As we have already indicated, he travelled a great deal, documents were prepared, some of which were published, trainees were received, training was given. Despite the vagueness of the information (particularly as regards identification of participants), it cannot be denied that considerable work was done between 1989 and 1994.[27] It would appear that during that period only the city of Marseille contributed towards the Programme's implementation, but the amount and the services rendered are not identified, although some estimates have been put forward.

We have already drawn attention[28] to the reference to a protocol and the first payment of US $50,000 announced as paid in 1991[29], even though we have no confirmation that it was in fact paid. In the financial report on the 1992-1993 biennium[30], a sum of US $40,000 appears as approved for this programme for the 1992 financial year, but not disbursed, while the city's contribution for the same period was estimated to be US $50,000.

In 1993, US $80,000 were also approved, of which US $40,000 were allocated on 1 July 1993 (although this does not necessarily mean that this amount was in fact disbursed) and the city's contribution was again estimated at US $50,000. Under such circumstances, it is extremely difficult to estimate the operating costs of the programme for the two stakeholders (UNEP and the city of Marseille).

Renewal of the programme was the subject of an agreement covering the period 1 August 1994 to 31 December 1996, with an extension to 31 January 1998. We have a copy of this agreement. According to this document, the total cost for 1994/1996 was estimated at US $565,000, of which US $294,000 were for the *Atelier du Patrimoine* and covered in-kind services. This must be compared with elements to be found elsewhere[31], which showed an approved budget of US $60,000 for the 1994/1995 and 1996 financial years, with an annual contribution from the city of Marseille, sometimes estimated at US $100,000 and sometimes at 83,000 Ecus.

This budget was intended to cover activities related to protection and preservation of the sites on the list, technical assistance and training/communication.

On 16 November 1994, an advance sum of US $40,000 was disbursed and on 11 August 1994, an additional advance of US $20,000 was paid out (a slight discrepancy with the accounts, which refer to a total payment of US $57,000).

---

[26] CP/ME/0401 94-22/Rev.3. Self-assessment report and closure document, May 1999.
[27] See Chapter 2 – The Functioning of the Project.
[28] See Chapter 1, 1.3, Budget.
[29] Report of the 7th Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties (UNEP(OCA)/MED IG.2/4).
[30] UNEP(OCA)/MED IG.3/Inf.4, of 15 July 1993.
[31] UNEP(OCA)/MED IG.3/4, of 15 July 1993 and UNEP(OCA)/MED/WG.89/4 of 7 March 1995.

3.4 Budget estimates
Athens, 3-8 April 1995

UNEP(OCA)/MED/WG.89/4
Page 48

(b) <u>Preservation of coastal historic sites of common Mediterranean interest (100 Historic Sites)</u>

<u>Objective</u>

To protect the coastal historic sites of common Mediterranean interest already identified by the Contracting Parties

<u>Activities</u>	Approved budget 1994	1995	Proposed budget 1996
	(in US $ '000)		(in US $ '000)
<u>Sites on the list of 100 Mediterranean Historic Sites</u>			
- Identify and evaluate the activities for protection and safeguarding of the listed sites	10	10	10
- Definition and finalization of projects related to the protection of historic sites, including permanent and emergency measures, in cooperation with local authorities	10	10	10
- Workshop on the establishment of permanent safeguarding plans and restoration of historic sites (15-18 participants)	15	-	-
- Workshop on the establishment of procedures for safeguarding historic sites (15-18 participants)	-	15	15
<u>Technical assistance</u>			
- Evaluation of the state of degradation of historic sites (consultants)	10	-	-
- Assistance to countries in the evaluation of major risks of historic sites and in the preparation of preventive measures (sub-contracts)	-	10	1-
<u>Training and communication</u>			
- Regional workshop on the management tools and methods for historic sites (15-18 participants)	-	15	15
- Regional workshop on stone degradation of historic sites (15-18 participants)	15	-	-
- Preparation and publication of fascicules on stone degradation	-	-	-
- Preparation and publication of fascicules on the protection of underwater archaeological sites, including shipwrecks	-	-	-
	1994	**1995**	**1996**
TOTAL MTF	60	60	60

3.5 The technical drift

At its meeting held in 1988[32], the Bureau quite clearly fixed the guidelines for the activities, indicating that the focus should not be "on the technical aspects of monument or site protection". On the one hand, in the majority of countries, these are the responsibility of the Ministry of Culture or its representatives and, on the other, a large number of organizations is already dealing with protection, exchange of experience, information on training in this field (UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICROM, ALESCO, various public or private bodies, archaeological missions, etc…). A European network of experts in historic monuments and sites, IPAC, is being established at the European level, with the objective *inter alia* of facilitating North-South cooperation.

Of the two subjects decided upon by the participants at the constituent meeting held in Marseille in 1989, namely:

- Receiving visitors, and

- conservation of materials and stone degradation,

the first is very relevant to the problem of **sustainable development** and is a **genuine challenge** in the Mediterranean. How to take advantage of and optimize the contribution of Mediterranean sites to economic development and the well-being of the population, while at the same time preserving this heritage and enhancing it so that it can be handed on to future generations in better condition. The second subject mainly concerns restoration techniques.

On several occasions, the Coordinator of the 100 Sites reaffirmed his determination not to concentrate on the technical aspects, but rather on protection through the programming and management of coastal zones. He laid emphasis on restoration and "conservation against the harmful effects of visitors".

Despite these declarations of intent, very rapidly after the Marseille meeting, the two major issues that emerged in the Programme were:

- the conservation of materials and stone degradation; and

- the protection of the underwater heritage, including shipwrecks.

The issue of tourism was set aside or was approached in an extremely general way.

---

[32] UNEP/BUR/31, already cited.

The emergence of this new priority issue[33], the underwater heritage, again highly technical and specialized and the subject of publications and seminars, surprised the rapporteurs, even though they understand the important role played by this heritage in awareness of intra-Mediterranean relations and ancient trade flows. They therefore sought to find its origin. The Barcelona Convention, then the Bureau meeting, when approving the list of 100 Sites in 1987 apparently addressed this question. On the other hand, the priority given to the "underwater heritage, including shipwrecks", which finally became "in particular shipwrecks", does not appear anywhere in the report on the discussions in Marseille, or in any case very indirectly when the participants fixed the objective of combating pillage of any sort. We have therefore noted the following statement: as regards shipwrecks and underwater sites or sites accessible by sea, the participants underlined the need to draw up a law or international protocol within the framework of the Barcelona Convention.[34] (A protocol is in the process of being adopted in UNESCO at the global level.) From there to considering that the priority issue for the 100 Sites should be the conservation of shipwrecks, there is a wide gap, but it was easily bridged because the *Atelier du Patrimoine* and the city of Marseille have invested a great deal in this issue and have undoubtedly gained a lot of know-how.

This also shows, if need be, the power of persuasion of the person who is at the origin of the reports and records of the meetings.

In contrast to the guidance given by the MAP Coordinator, Mr. Manos, who quite rightly recalled that **the ambition of this initiative was to promote an alliance among ecologists, archaeologists and managers**[35], this drift towards an increasingly technical approach to archaeology, underwater archaeology and architectural restoration has also had an impact on the choice of sites[36] to the detriment of urban areas and landscapes, ultimately, to consideration of the environment, the quality of the population's surroundings and landscape, social and economic aspects and management methods. This approach can to a large extent be explained by the narrowly-focused way in which the participants in the Marseille inaugural session were chosen. They were essentially archaeologists, heritage architects and curators, intended to constitute the basis for the future network.

This limitative approach was criticized on several occasions by the representatives of various countries (Italy, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic)[37] and should have led to a review of the programme. The question of whether such a programme had its place within MAP was raised or whether it belonged more to UNESCO or, at least, if it should not be redirected towards sustainable development and, in particular, the impact of tourism .

---

[33] It becomes the second priority in 1992 (UNEP(OCA)/MED/WG.40/2, of 16 January 1992).

[34] Record of the 1st meeting of authorities responsible for historic sites, Marseille, January 1989. Volume II "Guidelines for knowledge, safeguarding …", p.15, receiving visitors.

[35] Ibid, opening statement.

[36] See Annex I, List of historic sites of common Mediterranean interest.

[37] UNEP(OCA)/MED/WG.66/CRP.2, Malta, 27-30 October 1999. Damascus, 31 October 2000.

3.6   The inadequacy of the content

As we have noted above[38], the *Atelier du Patrimoine* drew up around 100 data sheets, whose content lacks balance.

A model data sheet and the data compilation call for the following comments:

-    The data sheet does not allow all the properties in the list to be identified, bearing in mind the diversity of types: although it more or less allows an archaeological site or a historical monument to be identified, it does not allow the identification of a natural area, a landscape or a group of urban buildings.

-    The title of the data sheet "Status of stone" is inappropriate; it is in fact an identification sheet that provides information under several very different headings.

-    As the classification chosen was restrictive, those drawing up the data sheets sometimes preferred to include historical notes of a general nature.

-    The compilation therefore contains two types of document: a data sheet and notes.

In conclusion, it can be stated that, when reading a data sheet or the compilation, one becomes aware of the heritage to be protected, but one does not see clearly the nature of the problem posed by the property nor what is expected of the Mediterranean Action Plan. The Programme's Secretariat was no doubt aware of the overly general nature of the compilation because the latest data sheets (France, Malta, Tunisia and Turkey) are much better documented and more explicit.

The purpose of the compilation should have been specified beforehand in the form of a methodology that would allow officials responsible for sites, members of the network, to make a **contribution to a specific problem**.

A plan for intervention – an action plan – that helps to strengthen professional links among those responsible for property and to build a political consensus among authorities can only be founded on an identification of the problem.

In addition to documenting history, the purpose of the data compilation is to seek professional solidarity and political consensus on the action plan.

In addition to the data sheets, some scientific studies have been published, and reports that contain more directly operational considerations have been prepared.

---

[38] Chapter 2, 2.3, Descriptive data sheets.

- The studies are usually very scientific[39]: they were entrusted to experts and are compilations of previous studies assessing the status of knowledge in the field, either in general or in relation to a more restricted geographical area.

- Technical assistance reports: these are operational studies prepared by Daniel Drocourt. They are part of bilateral cooperation and it might be questioned whether it is the responsibility of the Coordinator of a multilateral programme to carry out a **direct technical assistance mission**.

3.7   Inexistence of the network

The first objective of the 100 Historic Sites Programme was to set up a network of officials responsible for the sites selected.

These officials were invited to meet every two years and to draw up:

- A directory of the Mediterranean heritage;
- A bulletin of 100 Historic Sites;
- An address book of experts;
- A multilingual glossary of archaeological and architectural terms.

Twelve years later, with the exception of the data sheets referred to above, which could constitute the nucleus for a directory of the Mediterranean heritage, none of the above has been accomplished. A single plenary meeting of officials has been organized[40], with limited participation, and some regional meetings have been held on technical topics[41]. If one looks at the various statements contained in the records of the meetings of MAP bodies, the organization of many meetings is listed, more than 70 sites were visited, and a network of **280 officials responsible for sites** was set up.[42]

Faced with such statements, the rapporteurs nevertheless remain perplexed.

First of all, they had considerable trouble in obtaining the list of focal points (finally supplied by MAP) and were unable to obtain full information concerning the officials responsible for sites. Regarding the persons to be contacted in the course of their visits, some information was given on an *ad hoc* basis. It therefore appears that the *Atelier du Patrimoine* has not built up a computerized and regularly updated database of addresses. In addition, due to lack of time, the rapporteurs could not visit all the geographical areas concerned, so they focused on two countries: Italy and Tunisia.

---

[39] For example, the protection of the underwater archaeological heritage, December 1991; conservation of archaeological sites, stone degradation, the case of Greece, March 1995. See Annex, list of publications.
[40] Marseille, October-November 1994.
[41] Salonika, Stone degradation, June 1993; Bodrum, underwater heritage.
[42] See Chapter 2, 2.1 Visits, 2.2 Technical and scientific meetings, 2.4 Technical assistance.

As we have already mentioned, the Curator of Pompeii[43] knew nothing of the programme. In Tunisia, the persons in charge of Sousse, and the *Institut du Patrimoine*[44], not to mention the Curator of the site of Carthage, did not know of the intra-Maghreb meetings, even though they were enthusiastic about the idea. The latter confirmed that "since Marseille, nothing has happened, although the initiative gave rise to great hopes", and he said that he had never heard of the data sheets …[45], Most of the relations, when they occurred, appear to have been at the bilateral level between the Coordinator of the Programme and each person responsible for a site. **As to the "network"** itself, **it does not in fact exist**, because the various members that should have belonged to it know nothing about each other and, if they do supply information, they obtain no feedback. Such information only circulates, other than succinctly, at meetings of MAP, in the two reports to UNESCO, or at technical meetings, but only in a very limited manner.

One exception, in the form of an inventory, appears to be the case of Greece and stone degradation, but in this case the added value in comparison with other activities undertaken in the context of bilateral cooperation, especially by the French School in Athens, would need to be reviewed.

The persons interviewed, nevertheless, frequently stressed that the Marseille symposium responded to a concrete need (inter-regional cooperation, exchange of information, political and technical support for conservation, the management and enhancement of the heritage). Many wished to see the **programme continue, but on new bases**.

We have also noted that the 100 Sites Programme was little known except among those that had directly benefited from it or had been involved in developing it. For example, neither the Curator of Pompeii nor the person in charge of the Eumedis programme[46] nor the Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre[47] nor the official newly in charge at the Ministry of the Environment[48] had heard of the Programme. It is true that civil servants change posts, but the role of a network is precisely to inform and update. As to the involvement of local representatives, apart from the Marseille City Hall, we have few elements on which to assess this. We were, however, informed that in 1993 the City Hall of Salonika strongly opposed the proposal to entrust the *Atelier du Patrimoine* with a project to study a protected area.

It should nevertheless be stressed that several of those interviewed, both at the national and multilateral levels, expressed the desire to exchange experience and receive information in a wide variety of areas related to the management, conservation and enhancement of sites and their surroundings.

---

[43] See Annex 4.5, Interview with Mr. Pietro Guzzo.
[44] See Annex 4.6, Interview with Mr. Abdoulaziz Daoultali.
[45] See Annex 4.1, Interview with Mr. Nabli.
[46] See Annex 4.10, Interview with Ms. Ilhan Montacer.
[47] See Annex 4.3, Interview with Ms. Minja Yang.
[48] See Annex 4.9.

This is in harmony, *inter alia*, with the initiative launched by the French section of ICOMOS at the international level on the management of major sites and the subsequent measure adopted at Rayol-Canadel in October 2000 on the creation of a network of persons responsible for sites.

3.8   Personalization of the activities

At the proposal of the city of Marseille, the *Atelier du Patrimoine*, directed by the architect Daniel Drocourt, acts as the Programme's Secretariat.   Mr. Drocourt was initially assisted by Ms. Morel, with the support of the *Atelier*, and he has been deeply involved in the Programme at the personal level.   It is wholly identified with him.

In practice, we can see that it is a one-man operation, although he benefits from a solid support structure on which he rarely calls, except in the case of publications.

The number of sites visited and meetings attended are impressive, but it might be asked how, despite his enthusiasm and the time devoted to this task, Mr. Drocourt has managed to do all this while at the same time fulfilling his functions as head of a service that examines a large number of applications for building permits, as well as acting as an independent expert in many organizations, particularly in Europe.

Daniel Drocourt is a man of the field and contacts.   He is neither an administrator nor a manager.   This is difficult to reconcile, however, with the operating mode of a multinational organization that remains very formal.   The problems encountered by the rapporteurs and by the MAP Coordinator, as well as by UNEP's financial services, in obtaining precise reports on Mr. Drocourt's activities and management are one flagrant example.[49]   These remarks are similar to those in the report on the financial evaluation and the closure of the operation.[50]

With few financial resources available, Mr. Drocourt took advantage of his visits on various missions commissioned by other organizations, or even private visits at his own expense, to continue collecting information for the 100 Sites database and to take part in meetings.   This explains the problems encountered by the persons he contacted, particularly abroad, in trying to place him within a specific context and in identifying the 100 Sites Programme as such.

The foregoing shows, on the one hand, that such a Programme cannot be carried out in a purely administrative fashion and that personal involvement on the part of the person(s) responsible is essential, and, on the other, that one and same person cannot be expected to be both a field person, a technical expert, a network Coordinator, and an administrative and technical manager.

---

[49] See Annex 2.
[50] *Ibid.*

3.9 Inadequate multinational cooperation

As we have already emphasized, the activities conducted were essentially at the bilateral level with the *Atelier du Patrimoine* in Marseille. The Coordinator of the Programme in fact encouraged countries to enter into bilateral cooperation[51], and this is by no means negative, but it must not be forgotten that we are in a multilateral context in which bilateral cooperation can only be complementary, but cannot constitute a replacement.

One of the objectives fixed at the Marseille meeting was the implementation of **international cooperation and the mobilization of multinational credit**. This was reaffirmed on several occasions in MAP meeting reports.

The expectation of such a project is that it will help countries and persons responsible for sites to prepare programmes for funding in a European framework. The person in charge of such a network must be a facilitator, he must disseminate information, coordinate funding projects, even help to prepare them. But this was seemingly not the case, although there was a large amount of credit available that corresponded to the needs of the 100 Sites. For example, in European countries, credit could be mobilized through the Interreg and Leader programmes. In the case of North-South cooperation, the "SMAP" and Euromed Heritage in particular could play a role.

Daniel Drocourt has relations with many different international organizations and was therefore particularly well placed to facilitate access to multinational – especially European – funds. He did not do so, or at least very little. In a letter to Lucien Chabason[52], there is mention of very active participation in MED URBS. Further information shows that, in 1995, the *Atelier du Patrimoine* helped to prepare two files, Sousse and Tripoli in Lebanon.

Because of his personal involvement as an individual expert in various European programmes, Daniel Drocourt was unable to help prepare or support candidatures for activities under the 100 Sites Programme, on the one hand due to lack of time, and on the other for reasons of ethics because he might find himself in a conflict of interest situation. This is the case, for example, for the Euromed Heritage programme, where Daniel Drocourt's role is to evaluate the two phases. The same letter alludes to an information role carried out jointly with MEDA.[53] This point was clarified when a rapporteur met the person responsible for the Euromed Heritage programme. The meeting was originally fixed for 6 July and postponed at the request of Mr. Acosta Soto to 11 July. It is the subject of an annex.[54] In addition, another programme should have been mobilized and

---

[51] UNEP(OCA)/MED/WG.66/8 of 7 May 1993.
[52] See Annex 5.
[53] Letter of 3 April 2000, report.
[54] See Annex 4.11.

would have enabled the effective **installation of the network**, using the most sophisticated techniques. This was the **Eumedis Programme.**[55]

The French focal point for Eumedis had never heard of the 100 Sites programme.

Set up in the context of the Barcelona Convention and designed to bridge the gap between Euro-Mediterranean partners in the area of new information and communication technologies, Eumedis is the largest project ever carried out by the European Commission in this sector. Its objectives are:

- To establish a network of Mediterranean focal points and to finance an interconnection, based on the Internet, among European and Mediterranean research networks;

- To finance regional pilot projects in five sectors, including the **cultural heritage and tourism** (€7 million for each sector).

Each proposal must be put forward by a Euro-Mediterranean consortium composed of entities from at least two countries in the European Union and a group of Mediterranean bodies comprising the largest possible number of Mediterranean partners. The sponsor must be a public or private non-profit-making European body located in one of the Union's member States. Up to 80 per cent of the project's financing, over three years, is covered by MEDA. The invitation to present projects was issued in March 2000 and the time limit for putting them forward was January 2001.

The **100 Sites network fully met the criteria** and stood a good chance of being accepted, if it had been able to mobilize a large number of site directors. The following could have been proposed : the establishment of the network, the creation of the site, the completion of technical data sheets utilizing CAD and photogrammetry, the preparation of documents for the public, CAD-based visualization of planning projects, etc.

A valuable opportunity was lost and, in the view of the rapporteurs, this is a **serious omission**.

3.10   Reappraisal

Although it was adopted by the Contracting Parties, the Programme has not met with unanimous acceptance.

On the French side, first of all, the representatives of the Ministry of Culture in particular, possibly influenced in part by the views of archaeologists, echoing local rivalries, and the French section of ICOMOS, are very critical of Daniel Drocourt's action. He is

---

[55] Report on the Eumedis interview, Annex 4.11.

reproached with a lack of professionalism, withholding information, excessively personalizing activities, taking over work done by others and mixing categories. Above all, it is the lack of follow-up and the inability to provide reports on activities that have most irritated those responsible in ICOMOS France and ICOMOS International.

For some people, the issue is whether protection of the historic heritage should be rooted within MAP, whereas for others is more a question of refocusing the activities and entrusting them to another structure. This is the view of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and the Environment, which are in favour of pursuing the activities in another form.

On several occasions, some delegations (Spain, Italy, Syrian Arab Republic)[56] have raised questions concerning the justification for the activities (would it not be better to hand them over to UNESCO?), their overly technical nature, too concentrated on archaeological sites and not enough on ancient centres, tourism facilities or the environment.

Budgetary problems were not irrelevant to the questions raised about the Programme. After the difficulties experienced in 1992, it was necessary to refocus the budgets and make drastic cuts, even though two delegations were in favour of strengthening the Programme. As a result, in Malta in October 1999, the Italian representative requested that non-essential projects be removed and that an evaluation be made for this purpose. Despite several requests, neither the MAP Coordinator nor the UNEP financial officer[57], in spite of a very specific protocol, were able to obtain periodic reports on activities nor financial justification for the sums disbursed. This led to a first audit (self-assessment report) by UNEP, in which the auditor's conclusion was the following: "The Project Coordinator and Deputy Coordinator, well versed in the substance of the project, do not have the administrative and financial knowledge, or the organisational skills required to handle the project, therefore creating a discrepancy between the expectation raised by the project, its closure on an administrative level. In the future, UNEP/MAP will make sure that projects of that sort have **a person with the required administrative knowledge** to cover this important part of the project." Faced with the *Atelier du Patrimoine*'s inability to justify the expenditure incurred, it was decided to close the programme and request a partial refund amounting to US $13,580. This amount was refunded on 12 July 1998. The decision to evaluate the programme was taken in Malta at the Bureau meeting held in 1999 and then in Damascus the Bureau subsequently requested a thorough re-examination of the protection of the heritage. Lastly, in Athens[58], while awaiting the evaluation requested, it was proposed that the "monuments" approach should be abandoned in favour of the cultural, tourism and urban management aspects.

---

[56]UNEP(OCA)/MED/WG.66/CRP.2, Malta, 27-30 October 1999, Damascus 31 October 2000.

[57] Fax from Lucien Chabason of 23 October 1996. Fax from Mr. Tissot (MAP) to Mr. Ortega (UNEP) of 9 October 1998 stating *inter alia* the following: "As you know, we have been repeatedly and continuously trying for the past year through faxes, telephones, as well as personal contact, to get from Mr. Drocourt a Terminal Report, as well as the list of outputs under the above project, without any success…".

[58] Bureau meetings : Malta, 27-30 October 1999; Damascus, 31 October 2000; Athens, 15 and 16 January 2001.

*

*   *

PART II : THE FUTURE OF THE PROGRAMME

1. HYPOTHESIS OF CLOSURE OF THE PROGRAMME

Closure of the programme because of the disappointing way in which the Secretariat has functioned would no doubt content those who have not been convinced of the utility of an activity that is predominantly cultural in an action plan dealing with environmental problems. In their opinion, non-essential activities should be eliminated. The seemingly logical conclusion would be to hand over to UNESCO/World Heritage Centre, which would have the advantage of observing the functional division of the institutions.

The rapporteurs have shown that the Centre's mission is to conserve, to protect cultural property of outstanding universal value. This is basically different to UNEP's mandate, which is to protect cultural property, irrespective of its value – outstanding, remarkable, average – and to integrate it into the Mediterranean landscape through an action plan based on participatory planning methods.

To summarize, transfer of the programme – provided that this is agreed – to the UNESCO/World Heritage Centre would not necessarily serve the Mediterranean's interests and would contradict the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention. Moreover, the Centre does not hide that it is powerless to protect the vast number of sites throughout the world or to resolve all the problems, especially in view of the number of war zones.[59]

The rapporteurs, whose evaluation of the Secretariat's functioning was severe, nevertheless considered that the 100 Historic Sites Programme had demonstrated the importance of the cultural heritage in relation to Mediterranean issues.

For all the foregoing reasons, the rapporteurs are in favour of the continuation of the programme, subject to its refocusing.

2. PROPOSALS FOR REFOCUSING THE PROGRAMME

2.1   The problem of refocusing the programme

The cultural and natural properties on the Mediterranean's shores, which have witnessed historic events and seen many civilizations, dead for some but still living for others, are being affected by demographic growth, unbalanced by urbanization phenomena, development of tourism and socio-economic change, harmed by nuisances and pollution that degrade the environment.

---

[59] See Annex 4.3, Interview with Ms. Minja Yang, Deputy Director, UNESCO/World Heritage Committee, 11 June 2001.

This is a classical and somewhat redundant discourse. It is indeed brought out on every occasion and in various forms in virtually every local, national or international body.

For the rapporteurs, it is not question of repeating this sad conventional analysis, but on the contrary to show that such property, which it is feared here and there is disappearing, is at the same time needed to enlighten the quest for identity, to contribute to cultural development, and promote political dialogue in countries bordering this interior sea.

Identity, culture and politics are the heart of the problem in the Mediterranean Action Plan, which would nevertheless not be true to itself if the goals of protecting cultural and natural property, with the objective of sustainable development, were not spelled out clearly and strongly. The rapporteurs recall in this respect, if need be, that cultural values are a non-negligible factor of economic growth and social development nearly all over the Mediterranean basin. For some countries not endowed, or poorly endowed, with mineral resources, with an unfavourable soil and climate, the white sand on their beaches, the coastal scenery, the archaeological remains, the historic monuments and the groups of urban buildings constitute resources that are undoubtedly limited, although not always, but relevant. They allow seaside and cultural tourism, which must be viewed with the utmost attention as a **catalyst** for economic development. Tourism's share plays a far from negligible role in the trade balance of many Mediterranean countries and is continuing to expand.

Experts draw attention to tourism's effect on:

- Other sectors of activity (agriculture, construction, public works, transport, handicrafts), which are promoted and catalysed by tourist demand;
- The number of jobs and the cost of creating jobs are often higher than in industry;
- Investment is often more profitable than in other sectors and so attracts capital more easily;
- Foreign exchange earnings and coverage of the trade balance of payments.

Official car park at the Pompeii archaeological site
Photo taken after the closure of the site so it does not show the traffic jams where vehicles enter and leave nor the disorderly traffic on surrounding roads

Pompeii *Entrance to a villa; mosaic showing the household's guard dog*	*Pompeii* *Detail of a wall decoration*

The juxtaposition of the photo of the car park and the details of the mosaic and architecture of a villa in Pompeii is intended to underline the ugliness of the site's surroundings and the splendour of the architectural remains. The rapporteurs consider that special attention should be paid to accessibility, receiving visitors, prior reservations so as to prevent large crowds gathering, and limiting the numbers of visitors to the site's capacity, which would all help to integrate the heritage into its surroundings and ensure economic exploitation that respected the architectural remains.

"The Euro-Mediterranean declaration on tourism and sustainable development" (Hyères – Les Palmiers 1993) explicitly recognized the role and place of tourism in the Mediterranean economy. As far as heritage, cultural and natural values are concerned, however, awareness of their importance in the development process is still at an early stage. Only advertising agents know how to take advantage of them : "Tunisia – I am listening to your history" is the theme for the 2001 spring campaign. This argument has a real impact because, of the five million tourists, some three million visited the country's cultural property in 2000.

Spain, Greece, Egypt, and Turkey also use the cultural argument in their publicity, without putting off their clients. But the cultural argument only takes second place : **it is complementary to tourism activities and not a full-scale factor in development**, even when cities or entire regions derive benefits from the reputation of a particular archaeological site or historical centre.

The rapporteurs note that the current 100 Historic Sites Programme, without realizing it, helped to marginalize cultural and natural property by opting for a self-focused archaeological approach, losing sight of the goal of the Mediterranean Action Plan : sustainable development.

2.2 The title of the programme

As the rapporteurs have already shown, the current title of the Programme – 100 Historic Sites – is prejudicial to understanding of the issues. In order to respond to MAP's objectives, the title should refer to the concepts of heritage, culture and identity already specified by UNESCO in its recommendations and conventions. The rapporteurs propose the following title:

CULTURAL HERITAGE AND IDENTITIES IN THE MEDITERRANEAN TODAY

The concept of the cultural heritage is clearly defined in UNESCO documents[60]; it also includes "the combined works of man and of nature", which define in other words "the cultural landscape". Nature is thus included in the title, to the extent that it is considered as an **artefact**.

The concept of identity, in the plural so as to take into account the interpenetration of the major civilizations, is only of interest to the extent that it refers to the role that the

---

[60] Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Conventions), UNESCO 1972. Operational guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, UNESCO, World Heritage Centre 1999.

heritage plays or can play in contemporary life. Because of its identities, the Mediterranean is a unique component on the planetary scale – a "microcosm" – which intends to continue playing a certain role in the globalization process.

2.3   The selection criteria

In 1989, the "historic sites" were selected on the basis of criteria similar to those used in the World Heritage Convention without any reference to MAP's goals. The rapporteurs consider that these criteria need to be revised in order to define clearly the activities of UNESCO and UNEP.

According to the World Heritage Convention, UNESCO activities concern **protection per se** of cultural and natural property considered as being of **outstanding universal value.** On the basis of criteria and conditions of authenticity or integrity, inestimable and irreplaceable property, not only from each nation but from mankind as a whole, is selected. The objective of the World Heritage Committee is not to "protect all properties of great interest, importance or value, but only a select list of the most outstanding of these from an international viewpoint".[61]

According to the Marseille Charter, UNEP/MAP's activities are aimed at **the protection, in their environment**, of cultural and natural property, not as "rare objects of human construction (but) as inestimable testimony to the Mediterranean's cultural identity".

The World Heritage Convention and the Marseille Charter belong to different systems of logic.

- UNESCO formulates an ideology of conservation that is consistent with the founding philosophy of René Maheu regarding the universal civilization[62];

- UNEP/MAP formulates an ideology based on solidarity and participation in space and time, consistent with the philosophy of sustainable development.[63]

The rapporteurs propose that four selection criteria should be used and the eligible heritage of the Mediterranean Action Plan should:

- Bear testimony to history and civilizations;

- Be representative of the identity or identities of the population;

---

[61] Operational guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, UNESCO, World Heritage Centre, 1999.

[62] René Maheu "*La civilisation de l'universel. Inventaire de l'avenir*", Paris, Laffont Gonthier, 1996.

[63] "Despite their political, economic and cultural differences, Mediterranean people have realized the urgent need for **joint action** to halt the degradation of their surroundings", Michel Batisse "Blue Plan for the Mediterranean Peoples; from ideas to action", 1998.

- Play a role in modern life;

- Be part of the functioning of the living environment with a view to sustainable development.

2.4   Identification of cultural property

The rapporteurs consider that in MAP the classification of eligible cultural property should meet the definitions drawn up by UNESCO in its various recommendations and conventions, universal or outstanding value, however, need not be an absolute requirement.

The European Landscape Convention, approved in 2000, should also be taken into account as it underlines the important of natural areas in daily life.

To summarize these documents, the rapporteurs propose the following classification, which is less complex and better adapted:

- **Monuments**: architectural works of heritage importance from the point of view of history, art or science;

- **Architectural groups of buildings**: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of heritage importance from the point of view of history, art or science;

- **Urban, historic or traditional groups of buildings**: this heading comprises human constructions in urban surroundings and in rural areas whose cohesion and importance are recognized from the archaeological, architectural, historic, prehistoric, aesthetic or socio-cultural points of view.

In the wide variety of such ensembles, the following can be distinguished:

- Dead cities: immobile archaeological remnants of the past commonly called archaeological sites;

- Living historic towns (also called cities) which, by their very nature, have evolved and will continue to develop under the impact of socio-economic and cultural change.

Working-class district in the old part of Naples

Naples, integration of modern buildings into an ancient framework

Old city of Naples and XIXth century architectural heritage, the Umberto 1st Gallery

Patio of a villa in Herculaneum

*Caper bush encrusted in a crevice in a
a wall at Herculaneum.
The caper bush is found all over
the Mediterranean*

*Tunis, art déco architecture
Architectural heritage of the XXth century to be protected*

In this category, the following can be distinguished:

- Towns typical of a period or culture, which have been almost wholly preserved and have remained unaffected by subsequent developments;

- Towns whose development is typical and which have evolved along characteristic lines and have preserved, sometimes in the midst of exceptional natural surroundings, spatial arrangements and structures that are typical of the successive stages in their history;

- "historic centres" that cover exactly the same area as ancient towns and are now enclosed within modern cities;

- sectors, areas or isolated units which, even in the residual state, provide coherent evidence of the character of a historic town;

- new XIXth and XXth century towns of architectural or landscape importance and appreciated by those who live in or visit them.

- **Cultural landscapes**, "combined works of man and of nature". They include a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between humankind and its natural environment. There are three major categories:

- Clearly defined landscapes, designed and created intentionally by man, namely, gardens and parklands;

- Evolving landscapes, the result of an initial social economic, administrative and/or religious imperative; there are three categories:

  ∗ a relict landscape;

  ∗ a continuing landscape which still retains an active social role in contemporary society;

  ∗ a cultural landscape that combines religious, artistic or cultural manifestations with nature.

2.5   Lists of property

As mentioned above, the rapporteurs consider that the present list of property suffers from an imbalance from two standpoints: firstly, it favours archaeological sites, secondly it focuses on the outstanding importance of the heritage. They believe that more

emphasis should be laid on living historic towns and cultural landscapes; the selection should also take into account less remarkable properties which, however, play or may be called upon to play a concrete role in contemporary life.

In order to provide practical suggestions for the refocusing of the programme, the rapporteurs propose the establishment of two lists:

- **An inventory-list**, which would incorporate the "open list" drawn up according to the criteria in the Marseille Charter. This non-exhaustive list would remain open to Contracting Parties provided that the property to be included takes into account the new selection criteria and the refocusing of the classification.

- **A programme-list** or limited list corresponding to MAP's operational capacity. Each property included would require the mobilization of national and international expertise. In short, the number of properties included in this programme-list would depend on funding possibilities.

2.6 The Programme's objectives

In order to serve the cultural heritage and identities in the Mediterranean today, the programme must be clearly defined and its objectives declared. The rapporteurs recommend the following three major axes:

➢ Scientific and professional cooperation within a network;

➢ Public information and media coverage of the Programme;

➢ The preparation of symbolic projects.

2.6.1. Scientific and professional cooperation within a network

How to organize scientific and professional cooperation on the issue of the cultural heritage and Mediterranean identities?

The Marseille Charter refers to an "understanding" among those responsible for cultural property and calls on them to act within a "network" (point 9). The analysis has shown how difficult this was to achieve; how, in practice, can understanding be guaranteed and how can the network be made to function? The rapporteurs propose that the persons concerned reply to these two questions and, to enable them to do so, they suggest the convening of a **constituent assembly of members of the network** to consider:

  ∗ The issue of a Mediterranean network of persons responsible for cultural
    property and its objectives;
  ∗ The question of scientific and professional cooperation;
  ∗ The terms for the network's operation;
  ∗ Methods of communication for members of the network (is a bulletin needed
    or a Web site?).

In the opinion of the rapporteurs, the initiation of discussions among interested parties
themselves and the establishment of a dialogue on cooperation issues are a precondition
for rehabilitation of the programme.

2.6.2. Public information and media coverage of the Programme

The protection of the cultural heritage and the initiation of a dialogue on Mediterranean
identities requires the promotion of awareness among the public through action.

2.6.2.1 The perception of the cultural heritage

The fact that the "natural and cultural heritage of the Mediterranean is a unique asset"[64] is
frequently proclaimed by the institutions responsible for heritage, but not greatly shared
by the population which, in its daily life, does not feel itself to be concerned.

Archaeological sites are seen as constituting an obstacle to development; there have been
innumerable conflicts between archaeologists, who defend **their scientific reserves,** and
owners, who are either subjected to restrictions without compensation or consider that
they should able to use their property without any obligations or constraints.

Historic monuments are not in a favourable situation and, in many cases, the owner
abandons them, leaving them to fall down so that he can recover his land and put up a
new building. The Medina of Sousse, even though it is included in the World Heritage
List, is the victim of this process.

Cultural property protected by specialists in the name of history, art or science, is not
seen by the population, and often not by the local authorities either, as an important
heritage; this contradiction is frequently reported by the press in Cairo or Istanbul,
Algiers or Tunis. Take as an example this article in the Tunisian press (24 May 2001)
"Should the dilapidated buildings in Tunis be pulled down or renovated?"[65]

---

[64] In Blue Plan for the Mediterranean Peoples.

[65] Should the capital's old walls be pulled down or should all these treasures built over more than a century
be restored as they represent the ingenuity of a cosmpolitan and multifaceted population that made Tunis so
illustrious, a capital whose architectural riches make it one of the most famous cities in the Mediterranean?
The bitter struggle between owners and occupiers on the one hand, who cling to their rights, protected by
the law, but who have transformed these old buildings into a permanent danger to the public and, on the
other, the municipality, whose responsibility is the safety of the population and which defends a political

2.6.2.2 The metamorphosis of images of identity

The cultural heritage conveys images of identity that correspond to the great civilizations that shaped the landscapes and towns of the Mediterranean. Instead of remaining confined in the communities from which they emerged, images and symbols are metamorphosed in the imagination of the Mediterranean peoples. No doubt as a sign of modern times, the Mediterranean people are taking back the symbols of historic eras that do not, however, form part of their cultural sources.

This is the case in the Muslim world, which is asking itself about the periods prior to the Arab conquest: schoolchildren discover archaeological sites, visit museums where they imbibe Punic, Roman and Byzantine art.[66] This dissemination of images has an effect on the consciousness and intellectual life of the new generation, which sees the difference, the "otherness".

For a long time, architecture has been subject to cultural influence and one of its special trends is the neo-Moorish expression present along most of the Mediterranean's shores, both North and South. For example, "La Palestine" villa, built in 1900 in the Estaque district of Marseille. The architecture and the decoration of the facades is taken from the Arabized tradition that the architect Raphaël Guy conceptualized under the syncretistic title of "Modern Arab-style architecture". It is an exceptional work of the beginning of the century that shows how the peoples of the Mediterranean managed to integrate their cultural sources and invent metamorphosed images of their identities.

Architectural works such as "La Palestine" villa are often found around the Mediterranean. The tragedy is their almost systematic disappearance under the pressure of urban renewal.

Countries of the North Mediterranean have legal tools, institutions and the necessary financial resources to protect and list them as historic monuments. Those of the South Mediterranean list the buildings but do not protect them because they do not have the resources to compensate the owners or to give financial incentives nor the money to restore the structures.

---

approach that is trying to transform Tunis into a capital worthy of the name. Who lives in these houses and buildings? Why are they so determined to continue living in dilapidated and dangerous buildings? What do those responsible intend to do to resolve these problems? By pulling down the capital's buildings, does one not wipe out a past which, even if it is linked to the colonial era, is part of our collective memory and our cultural heritage? This is an issue that is ultimately a national one.

[66] The rapporteurs themselves were questioned at length by two people from the area, apparently taking their daily walk, on the reservoirs in Carthage, their purpose, their history … This curiosity marks a change in the perception of history and identity.

LA PALESTINE VILLA

Shortly after 1900, a merchant from Bourges who became wealthy in the textile industry and without any known links to the South of France, decided to move to Marseille and had a neo-Moorish villa built in Estaque. The district of Estaque looks south on to the sea: it is to the north-east of the Séon basin, whose economy is based on brick and cement works. Attracted by the Orient, Mr. Leclerc commissioned a local building firm, Olive Bros., to build a villa based on a model he had seen in a Universal Exhibition. The villa was built over two seasons and its south façade shows the characteristic elements of neo-Moorish works : a minaret, merlons, projecting arches, decorative relief patterns, ceramic tiles and polychrome surfaces. Inside, two loggias one above the other, one of which is whitewashed, are covered with friezes freely inspired by Hispano-Moorish designs. As often occurs in this type of architecture, the decoration is an amalgam of elements from different styles and cultures, put together in an ostentatious fashion in order to correspond to an image of the Orient. In this spirit, the construction in local materials is adapted and voluntarily resorts to *trompe l'oeil* so as to respond to the requirements of the owner.[67]

---

[67] Sylvie Denante – Summary – Conservation Régionale des Monuments Historiques. 60-Inv.MH., 16 November 1993.

2.6.3. The preparation of symbolic projects

The rapporteurs consider that the cultural heritage and identities programme suffers from a lack of pragmatism and MAP's efforts are diluted in the various forms of multilateral and bilateral intra-Mediterranean cooperation. The local population and authorities do not feel themselves involved in the drawing up of data sheets, studies or reports. This can be seen not only in the statements by local bodies, but also in those of international organizations.[68] There should be more tangible projects to serve as an example.

The rapporteurs consider that MAP, which prides itself on participatory planning, should give a strong **methodological signal**, utilizing its expertise to prepare symbolic projects so as to show how:

* to mobilize the actors and invite them to participate;

* to organize consultation with local, regional and national organizations involved in or responsible for protecting the heritage. In this connection, experience has shown that the functioning of a tripartite commission (culture, tourism and environment) is a very sensitive matter without the presence of a mediator, a role often played by an expert from outside the authorities concerned;

* to organize cooperation with international institutions and promote synergy. In this respect, the involvement of UNESCO and the European Union through the Euromed Heritage and Eumedis programmes is essential. As already noted by the rapporteurs, the previous 100 Historic Sites Programme did not achieve any practical results in cooperation;

* to seek a technical and political consensus and to draw up a project document to enable:

    – the mobilization of the necessary expertise;
    – the mobilization of funds. In this connection, the World Bank and MEDA currently play a decisive role in funding the cultural heritage. It is vital to seize the opportunity
    – an appeal to sponsors.

The advantage of preparing symbolic projects is:

* the inclusion of cultural property on which the national authorities have already made a commitment to act;

---

[68] See Annex 4.3, Interview with Ms. Minja Yang, Deputy Director, UNESCO/ World Heritage Committee, 11 June 2001.

∗ a thematic approach to the problems, for example:

– Receiving tourists and managing flows both around and within an archaeological site. This question, raised by the Curator of Pompeii, is of concern to all site curators. An in-depth review, together with a demonstration of know-how, are an urgent necessity.

– The elaboration of a plan to safeguard and enhance historic and traditional groups of buildings. To date, no medina in the Arab world has a plan to protect it. The Medinas of Tunis, Sousse, Algiers and Fez are included in the World Heritage List, but none of them has a legally valid document to protect them. This is, however, a requirement of the UNESCO Convention.

– The formulation of a plan to protect the architectural and urban heritage in a district or town of the XIXth or XXth centuries, together with the necessary funds;

– The mobilization of funds for a project that meets with consensus and an appeal for sponsors.

The rapporteurs consider that MAP's involvement in symbolic projects would help to meet the expectation of tangible results called for by the local population and authorities. It is of course a difficult path and it implies commitment throughout the methodological chain of project preparation.

The difficulty nonetheless has a dual advantage: the project will be remembered just as today we still remember the Abu Simbel campaign, which greatly enhanced UNESCO's reputation. It will have a catalytic effect even if this is only because of the method used.

2.7   The Programme's perspectives

The five Regional Activity Centres (BP, PAP, SPA, ERS, CP) are certainly in advance of the 100 Historic Sites Programme, which appears to be the not too healthy baby of MAP, and it is not known whether it will survive evaluation.

The rapporteurs consider that the attention to be paid by the Contracting Parties to the "cultural heritage and the identities of the Mediterranean today" will only bear fruit if MAP undertakes an in-depth forward-looking review and makes a serious effort to look to the future and trace the outline.

The cultural heritage and the identities of the Mediterranean today imply long-term action; the experience of the North's countries shows the progress made from the legal,

institutional and financial viewpoints since the beginning of the century. Current successes are not the result of waving a magic wand but of ongoing effort.

Countries of the South have been following this path only for three or four decades, in a context sometimes marked by the struggle against under-development, and by decolonization and the search for national identities. Some economists or financial experts intimate that it is not a priority activity.

The rapporteurs consider that an action programme on the heritage and identities must be designed for the long term in order to utilize the experience gained and draw lessons from inadequacies or mistakes.

From this standpoint, the current 100 Sites Programme should be considered as a positive step along the complex road to protection. If the Contracting Parties to the Barcelona Convention pursue the effort already begun, they will be paying tribute to François Braudel, who showed the impact of the long term on the metamorphosis of the Mediterranean's land and society.

In practical terms, the rapporteurs suggest that the programme be rehabilitated for a period of five years: one year of preparation and two periods of two years for implementation.

3.   PROPOSALS ON REORGANIZING THE INSTITUTIONS

In the rapporteurs' view, the 100 Historic Sites Programme is not adapted to the structure set up in order to achieve MAP's objectives. The operation of a "network" of 122 cultural properties scattered throughout the Mediterranean requires well-defined organization, together with a large dose of expertise and an explicit plan of work. The analysis has shown, however, the institutional uncertainties, the personalization of the Secretariat, the Programme's drift.

The rapporteurs believe that the maladjustment noted is congenital because the signatories to the Marseille Charter did not give themselves the means to achieve their goals, as can be seen from point 10:

-        The "network" is supposed to operate with simple structures without creating new structures in the sense of institutions;

-        The "network" is supposed to rely on large bodies such as UNESCO, ALECSO, ICOMOS, ICOM, ICCROM in order to achieve synergy.

No doubt too much has been asked of the *Atelier du Patrimoine* and the city of Marseille, whose essential contribution was to make available the Secretariat composed of the

architect Daniel Drocourt, assisted by an archaeologist, Ms. Morel. This is an enormous task for a single person so it is not surprising that it led the Secretariat to personalize relations not only with officials responsible for sites (the majority of whom do not know each other), but also with counterparts in the large institutions. Such a situation is regrettable for the operation of the Secretariat and is the result of … the simple structure.

3.1   Institutional scenarios

Institutional reorganization can be envisaged along three lines:

- Restructuring of the current Secretariat;

- Transfer of the Secretariat to another partner;

- Creation of a Regional Activity Centre.

Scenario 1 : Restructuring of the current Secretariat

- The rapporteurs consider that the *Atelier du Patrimoine* is a competent professional structure in its field, but it does not have sufficient support to carry out the wide variety of tasks inherent in a heritage programme refocused on sustainable development issues. It cannot therefore continue without radical reorganization. The Secretary General of Marseille City Hall[69] agrees and says that he is prepared to envisage another form of cooperation combining the *Atelier du Patrimoine* and the Mediterranean Institute (*Institut de la Méditerranée),* with a view to refocusing the Programme on sustainable development:

- The *Atelier du Patrimoine* would continue to lend its support on specific and identified cooperation issues within its field of competence and according to a very explicit protocol drawn up by the member countries;

- The Mediterranean Institute, an association directed by Professor J.L. Reiffers, financed by the Regional Council, the General Council, the city of Marseille and the Chamber of Commerce, could be involved in the Programme's new objectives.

If combining these two bodies is possible – the details need to be worked out – the French authorities will have to appoint a head of mission, approved by the various local and regional authorities of Marseille but also by the Ministries of Culture and the

---

[69] Record of the interview with Mr. Jean-Claude Gondard, Secretary General of the city of Marseille, 27 June 2001.

Environment. The Secretariat's restructuring will only be possible if the French authorities agree to make a more substantial contribution (expertise, budget) to MAP.

Scenario 2 : Transfer of the Secretariat to another partner

The rapporteurs consider that transferring the Secretariat to another partner could be envisaged on the basis of a call for candidatures addressed by MAP to member States interested in following on from the *Atelier* and the city of Marseille.

This solution has two advantages:

- It would show what potential competences were prepared to commit themselves to the Programme;

- It would allow the mobilization of other competences and, perhaps, associate them. There could be a division of labour among the various partners concerned with different issues (cultural tourism, social housing in urban historic centres, sectors protected, cultural landscapes, etc), provided that the action was coordinated by a head of mission approved by all the parties.

The rapporteurs believe that this solution has the advantage of diversity, but it may give rise to problems for MAP itself in terms of coordination and joint intervention.

Scenario 3 : Creation of a Regional Activity Centre

The rapporteurs consider that the creation of a Cultural Heritage and Identities Regional Activity Centre would be a good solution. It would:

1. Place the heritage issue on the same level as the other issues considered by the MAP in the context of sustainable development.

2. Clarify MAP's institutional structure by eliminating the overlapping of issues (biodiversity and heritage) in SPA/RAC. In the rapporteurs' view, this overlapping is a source of considerable confusion.

3. Clarify relations with focal points, which prefer to contact UNEP/MAP rather than an associated partner which is suspected of giving priority to bilateral relations – even if this is not true.

4. Give legitimacy to the network, whose members would address themselves to a MAP institutional structure and not to an associated partner.

5.   Facilitate cooperation with international organizations (UNESCO/World Heritage Centre, World Bank, European Union – Euromed Heritage programme, Eumedis, SMAP -, organizations such as the World Tourism Organization and ICOMOS, etc).

The creation of a Cultural Heritage and Identities/RAC, which has the support of the Ministry of the Environment[70], has not been examined in depth by the rapporteurs because their task was the restructuring of the current Secretariat.

3.2   Mobilization of human resources

Whichever scenario is adopted, the institutional restructuring will depend on the scope of the programme's focus, the objective assigned to it, and the calendar fixed. In view of these variables, human resources will have to be flexible, but the basic structure should meet the following criteria:

3.1.1   Leadership of the institution

The rapporteurs consider that, if possible, the leadership of the programme should not be entrusted to an archaeologist or architectural expert in historic monuments so as to prevent the technical drift noted in the current system and not to limit the action to one particular sector.

In support of UNEP's view[71], they believe that the person in charge of the institution should preferably be a generalist with the following qualities:

-       Responsiveness to cultural and identity issues proven through well-established professional experience;
-       In-depth knowledge of the departments concerned, for example, culture, environment, and tourism;
-       Sufficient familiarity with international organizations (UNESCO, UNDP, World Bank, European Commission);
-       Public relations skills for the purposes of consultation with the focal points and the members of the network and as a representative of the programme vis-à-vis member States (acting as a heritage ambassador);
-       Fluency in foreign languages;
-       Administrative and financial management experience.

---

[70] Record of the interview with Ms. Emmanuelle Leblanc, International Action Service, Ministry of the Environment (France, 4 July 2001).
[71] See the final report of 7 May 1999.

3.1.2   The Programme's permanent experts

Refocusing the programme on sustainable development goals means creating a united team whose experts are familiar with participatory planning methods and know how to work together. In order to meet the principal objectives of the programme, the following five experts are needed:

→   Architect – town planner :

Area of competence : urban planning :

- Protected sectors;
- Areas where the architectural and urban heritage is to be protected;
- Social housing in historic urban areas;

Tasks :

- Critical evaluation of the situation of cultural property;
- Appraisal of the results and issues;
- Proposed solutions;
- Preparation of projects;

→   Historic monuments architect :

Tasks:

- Critical evaluation of the situation of cultural property;
- Appraisal of the results and issues;
- Proposed solutions;
- Preparation of legal cases related to protection;
- Preparation of projects;

→   Architect – landscape designer :

Area of competence :

- Cultural landscapes;
- Historic gardens and archaeological parks;
- Cultural tourism/visitors to archaeological sites and historic towns;
- Coastal planning;
- Urbanism and town planning;

Tasks:

- Critical evaluation of the situation of cultural property;
- Appraisal of the results and issues;
- Proposed solutions;
- Preparation of legal cases related to protection;
- Assistance in preparing projects;

→ Economist :

Area of competence :

- Urban planning/social housing/tourism/cultural engineering;

Tasks:

- Preparation of funding proposals;
- Search for funds, appeals to sponsors;

→ Historian/journalist :

Tasks:

- Informing the public, media coverage of the programme. The professional staff should not undertake direct action, but should monitor the situation and help in preparing projects.

3.2.3 Associate experts

Neither archaeologists nor jurists shold belong to the permanent team because, although their role is essential, their services are not required on an ongoing basis.

→ All Mediterranean countries have archaeological institutions and archaeologists responsible for sites in permanent contact with international institutions and the major archaeological teams in European universities. It is thus of little use to add to a system that has been tried and tested by appointing an architect to the Programme on a permanent basis. On the other hand, it is essential to be able to provide special expertise to a person responsible for site who is facing a particular problem.

→ The preparation of a list of classified sites or protected areas raises legal problems that will have to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis and upon

request, providing any information necessary for preparing the lists and building teams.

The role is one of helping to ensure that the work is undertaken, but it in no way involves undertaking the work oneself.

CONCLUSION

At the conclusion of their study, the rapporteurs found that the 100 Historic Sites Programme had not achieved its objectives due to the lack of precision in its goals and the unsatisfactory functioning of the Secretariat directed by the *Atelier du Patrimoine* of the city of Marseille. The "network", designed to bring together persons responsible for sites, is practically non-existent, with the result that potential partners are disillusioned.

The drift towards archaeological techniques has diverted the programme from its overall objectives.

In conclusion, action such as that conducted to date should not be allowed to continue. The 100 Historic Sites Programme has nevertheless aroused expectations and the vast majority of those consulted underlined their interest, provided that the programme refocuses on the issue relevant to MAP – environmental protection – and its ultimate goal, namely, sustainable development.

The rapporteurs therefore propose that the programme should be reactivated without delay under the title "Cultural heritage and identities in the Mediterranean today".

United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites Programme

Evaluation report
July 2001

Annex 1
List of historic sites of common Mediterranean interest

Updated on 2 July 2001

A.S.	**:**	Archaeological site
H.M.	**:**	Historic monument
H.U.B.	**:**	Groups of historic urban buildings
H.T.U.B.	**:**	Groups of historic and traditional urban buildings

COUNTRY	NAME	Date of inclusion in the World Heritage List	TYPE OF PROPERTY		CLASSIFICATION
			Natural	**Cultural**	
Albania	- Appollonia			X	A.S.
	- Durres			X	A.S.
	- Butrint	1992	X	X	A.S.
Algeria	- Algiers	1992		X	A.S.
	- Cherchell		X	X	A.S.
	- Hippone			X	A.S.
	- Tipasa	1982		X	A.S.
Croatia	- Dubrovnik	1979-1994		X	H.U.B.
	- Hvar & Korcula				A.S.
	- Split	1979			A.S.
	- Trogir	1997	X	X	A.S.
	- Zadar		X	X	A.S.
Cyprus	- Famagusta			X	H.M.
	- Khiriokitia			X	A.S.
	- Kourion			X	A.S.
	- Limassol			X	A.S.
	- Paphos	1980		X	A.S.
	- Salamina			X	A.S.
Egypt	- Abu Mena	1979		X	A.S.
	- Islamic Cairo	1979		X	H.T.U.B.

	- Gizeh	1979		X	A.S.
	- Memphis	1979		X	A.S.
	- Saqqarah			X	A.S.
	- Necropolis of Alexandria			X	A.S.
France	- Aigues-Mortes			X	H.U.B.
	- Arles	1981		X	A.S.
	- Cucuruzzu & Filitosa			X	A.S.
	- Fréjus			X	A.S.
	- Marseille/Old port		X	X	A.S.
Greece	- Athens	1987		X	A.S.
	- Corfu			X	H.U.B.
	- Crete			X	H.U.B.
	- Delos	1990	X	X	A.S.
	- Delphi	1987	X	X	H.U.B.
	- Epidaurus & Nauplia		X	X	A.S.
	- Mount Athos/Simonos Petra		X	X	A.S. H.U.B.
	- Mycenae-Tyrins	1999		X	A.S.
	- Mystras				A.S.
	- Olympia	1989		X	A.S.
	- Paros & its quarries	1989		X	A.S.
	- Rhodes			X	
	-Salonika			X	
	- Samos	1988		X	
	- Santorini		X	X	
	- Thasos & its quarries		X	X	
Israel	- Acre			X	H.U.B.
	- Caesarea on the sea			X	A.S.
Italy	- Agrigento	1997	X	X	H.S.
	- Amalfi	1997		X	H.U.B.
	- Aquileia	1998		X	H.U.B.
	- Bari			X	H.U.B.
	- Carrara quarries		X	X	A.S.
	- Barumini/Su Nuraxi	1997		X	A.S.
	- Genoa			X	H.U.B.
	- Lecce			X	H.U.B.
	- Naples	1995		X	H.U.B.
	- Pompeii	1997		X	A.S.
	- Herculaneum/the Phlegrean fields	1997		X	A.S.
	- Paestum/Poseidonia	1998		X	A.S.
	- Palermo & Monreale			X	H.U.B.
	- Pisa/Piazza del Duomo	1987		X	H.U.B.
	- Ravenna	1996	X	X	H.U.B.
	- Rome & Ostia			X	A.S.
	- Segesta			X	A.S.
	- Selinunte			X	A.S.
	- Syracuse			X	A.S.
	- Tarquinia/Etruscan necropolises			X	A.S.
	- Trieste			X	H.U.B.

	- Venice & its lagoon	1987		X	H.U.B.
Lebanon	- Byblos	1984		X	A.S.
	- Sidon			X	A.S.
	- Tyr	1984		X	A.S.
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	- Cyrenaica	1982		X	A.S.
	- Leptis Magna	1982		X	A.S.
	- Sabratha	1982		X	A.S.
Malta	- Ggantiga	1987		X	A.S.
	- Hal Saflieni	1987		X	A.S.
	- Valetta	1980	X	X	A.S.
	- Tarxien	1992			A.S.
	- Hagar Qim	1992			A.S.
	- Mnajdra	1992			A.S.
	- Ta' Hgrat	1992			A.S.
	- Skorba	1992			A.S.
Monaco	- Oceanographic Museum		X	X	H.M.
Morocco	- Tetouan	1997		X	H.T.U.B.
Spain	- Ampurias			X	A.S.
	- Barcelona				H.U.B.
	- Cordoba	1984-1994		X	H.U.B.
	- Granada	1984-1994		X	H.U.B.
	- Ibiza/Dalt Vila fortification	1999		X	A.S.
	- Mallorca/Palma cathedral & palace			X	H.M.
	- Malaga			X	H.U.B.
	- Minorca/Taulas/ Talayots and Navetas			X	A.S.
	- Murcia			X	H.U.B.
	- Seville	1987		X	H.U.B.
	- Tarragona	2000		X	A.S.
	- Valencia & Albufera		X	X	H.U.B.
Syrian Arab Republic	- Ugarit/Ras Shamra			X	A.S.
Tunisia	- Carthage & Sidi Bou Said	1979	X	X	A.S.
	- Djerba			X	H.M.
	- El Jem	1979		X	A.S.
	- Kerkouane	1985-1986		X	A.S.
	- Sousse	1988		X	H.T.U.B.
	- Tunis	1979		X	H.T.U.B.

Turkey	- Antalya			X	A.S.
	- Aspendos			X	A.S.
	- Brousse			X	A.S.
	- Didymes			X	A.S.
	- Ephesus			X	A.S.
	- Fethiye/Olüdeniz		X	X	A.S.
	- Halicarnassus/Bodrum		X	X	A.S.
	- Istanbul	1985		X	H.U.B.
	- Kaunos		X	X	A.S.
	- Kekova		X	X	A.S.
	- Knidos			X	A.S.
	- Millet		X	X	A.S.
	- Pergamum		X	X	A.S.
	- Phaselis		X	X	A.S.
	- Priene			X	A.S.
	- Troy	1998		X	A.S.
	- Xanthos/Letoon	1988		X	A.S.
Yugoslavia	- Kotor	1979	X	X	A.S.

SUMMARY TABLE

COUNTRY	Number of sites	Sites included in the World Heritage List	Natural and cultural property	Cultural property	Archaeological site	Historic monument	Group of urban buildings	
							Historic	Historic & traditional
Albania	3	1	1	2	3			
Algeria	4	2	1	3	3			1
Croatia	5	3	2	3	4		1	
Cyprus	6	1	--	6	5	1		
Egypt	6	4	--	6	5			1
France	5	1	1	4	4		1	
Greece	16	7	6	10	13		3	
Israel	2	--	--	2	1		1	
Italy	22	11	3	19	11		11	
Lebanon	3	2	--	3	3			
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	3	3	--	3	3			
Malta	8	8	1	7	8			
Monaco	1	--	1	--		1		
Morocco	1	1	--	1				1
Spain	12	5	1	11	4	1	7	
Syrian Arab Republic	1		--	1	1			
Tunisia	6	5	1	5	3	1		2
Turkey	17	3	7	10	16		1	
Yugoslavia	1	1	1	--	1			
TOTAL	**122**	**58**	**26**	**96**	**88**	**4**	**25**	**5**

United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites programme

Evaluation report
July 2001

Annex 4
List of records of interviews (with the agreement of the persons interviewed)

4.1   Mr. Abdelmajid Nabli, Curator of the site of Carthage, Tunisia, 13 May 2001.

4.2   Mr. Serge Antoine, telephone interview, 25 May 2001.

4.3   Mrs. Minja Yang, Deputy Director, World Heritage Centre, UNESCO, 11 June 2001.

4.4   Mr. Aldo Iacomelli and Mr. Guerrieri, Ministry of the Environment, Rome, 12 June 2001.

4.5   Mr. Pietro Giovanni Guzzo, Curator of the site of Pompeii, 13 June 2001.

4.6   Mr. Abdelaziz Daoulatli, historian, research scientist, former Director of the *Institut National de la Patrimoine*, Tunis, 16 June 2001.

4.7   Mr. Adel Hentati, expert, in charge of SPA/RAC, and Mr. Chedli Raïs, engineer, fisheries expert at SPA/RAC, Tunis, 16 June 2001.

4.8   Mr. Jean-Claude Gondard, Secretary General of the City Hall of Marseille, 27 June 2001.

4.9   Mrs. Isabelle Longuet, International Action Service, Ministry of Culture, France, 28 June 2001.

4.10   Mrs. Emmanuelle Leblanc, International Action Service, Ministry of Culture, France, 4 July June 2001.

4.11   Mrs. Ilhan Montacer, Assistant to Mr. Pierre Fontaine, Eumedis focal point for France, 5 July 2001.

4.12   Mr. Francesco Acosta Soto, Directorate General of Foreign Relations, European Commission, in charge of the Euromed Heritage programme, Brussels, 11 July 2001.

4.13   Mr. Luxen, Secretary General of ICOMOS International and Mrs. Consuelo Leon, his assistant, Brussels, 12 July 2001.

United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites programme

Evaluation report
Annex 4.1

Record of the interview with Mr. Abdelmajid Nabli, Curator of the site of Carthage, Tunisia, 13 May 2001

1. The advantages of the initiative

Mr. Nabli considers that the **100 Sites initiative was extremely interesting and responded to a real need**. Those in charge of sites feel very isolated, both within their country and vis-à-vis the international community. The fact of gathering together around a common entity - the Mediterranean - representatives of countries with different political regimes, cultures and living standards, but with identical problems concerning the conservation and enhancement of their heritage was seen as encouragement and recognition of the efforts made. **The constituent meeting held in Marseille in 1989 was very positive**. Each country explained the situation, those in charge of sites met each other, exchanged experiences, spoke of their problems, and valuable contacts were established among them. Since then, however, nothing has happened. It would be of interest to set up a real network for the exchange of information, support and intra-Mediterranean technical cooperation on common issues. This is what is expected. But there has been no **feedback of information, no follow-up**.

2. The sites, the common heritage of the Mediterranean and the world

The site of Carthage is recognized at the global level and is part of the world's heritage, it has the advantage of being on protected land, but it is nevertheless vulnerable. The plan that was drawn up to protect the site has still not been incorporated into the land use plan and appetites are keen. The city of Tunis and its surroundings are experiencing unprecedented urban growth. The defenders of sites, the competent Ministries, especially when they are new, need support in their efforts to preserve sites against the temptation to remove them from the list. In this connection, the influence of the international community and examples of enhancement of similar sites are decisive. The sites concerned belong to the country in which they are situated, but as they are the result of layers of different cultures common to other Mediterranean countries, they in fact belong to a much wider community, which in some cases means that they enjoy international recognition. Making World Bank loans subject to a measure of conditionality, as emphasized in the recent letter from ICOMOS with regard to Afghanistan, can lead States to greater respect for their obligation to protect the heritage of which they have the "usufruct". This heritage is called on to play a major social, economic and cultural role.

The rapporteurs noted that the sites at Carthage are not only visited by tourists, but increasingly by Tunisians.

3. Exchange of information

MAP could give site officials considerable help by establishing a network to allow the circulation of legal and technical information and the exchange of information on positive experiences, and also – why not – an analysis of the causes of failure? It would be interesting to have **periodic status reports** on the progress made at each site and to **disseminate** these. The visit by the *Atelier du Patrimoine* of Marseille was very instructive in this regard because it showed the advantage of integrating the heritage approach into the urban environment management process.

4. Regular rotating meetings

A meeting every two years at a different site to allow an assessment of the progress made or any retrogression and to present *in situ* the policy of a town, would be very instructive,not only for the participants but also for political authorities responsible for hosting and organizing such a meeting, and it would help to promote awareness of heritage issues.

5. Transfer to MAP

There may be doubts concerning the relevance of transferring the 100 Historic Sites Programme, which involves sectors as diverse as archaeology, medinas, urban sites, the underwater heritage, to the Specially-Protected Areas sector, which is usually administered by scientists, ecologists or chemists, whose concerns and approaches are far removed from the protection and enhancement of a historic heritage.[72]

6. The absence of a follow-up

Mr. Nabli has only seen Mr. Drocourt once since 1989, in 1994, and he was not certain in what capacity he was there (city of Marseille, ICOMOS, European Union?), but in any event there was no mention of MAP. He therefore wonders **why**, after the resounding declarations by the highest authorities in MAP and UNESCO, **nothing happened**? It would seem that responsibility does not only lie with the instigator of the programme.

In conclusion, it was a good idea, disappointing, because it did not have practical effects, and it should be re-launched in a more systematic and better organized way.

---

[72] The person in charge of the Specially-Protected Areas has published a **leaflet on Carthage**, which is very well prepared, but it is **out of stock**. This is an initiative that should be **repeated.**

United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites programme

Evaluation report
Annex 4.2

Record of the telephone interview with Mr. Serge Antoine, 25 May 2001

Among the programmes launched within the MAP framework, a distinction has to be drawn between those that come under supported Centres (Blue Plan) or under "hosted Centres" established by the countries:

Palermo -	remote sensing;
Barcelona -	clean technologies;
Marseille -	100 Historic Sites.

As regards the budget, the MAP Coordinator should be asked how much was estimated in the budget and how much was actually disbursed for this Programme. The question now is should the network continue? The structure exists. Daniel Drocourt, with his qualities and failings, has done sterling work. The middle ground between a single person and an assembly line has to be found.

Suggestion

Why not establish a small structure, a sort of cabinet, composed of three countries from the South and three countries from the North?

The issues selected are those that deal with the interaction between the environment and heritage.

For example, the following problems were tackled:

Pollution	
Salt	which led to the study on stone
Desertification	degradation
Erosion	
Seismic effects	
Rise in sea level	which led to the study of the underwater
Effects of salinity or changes	heritage
in salinity and humidity ratios	

A third aspect appears to be important and concerns the issue of sustainable development, namely, man's impact on heritage conservation.

Pollution is one effect, but also tourism and the problems caused by excessive numbers of tourists (and urban development).

In this connection, Serge Antoine suggests a visit to Alexandria and Saint Catherine, which are good examples of these problems.

What is important in this approach is the mixture of cultures and the need to achieve economies of scale.

It would be desirable for France to become more closely involved in this Programme.

United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites programme

Evaluation report
Annex 4.3

Record of the interview with Mrs. Minja Yang, Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre at UNESCO, 11 June 2001

Mr. Banderin was unable to receive us and we were received by Mrs. Yang, who has only been in her post for a few months and had never heard of the 100 Sites. We recall that at the Marrakesh meeting (December 1999) it had been agreed that the 100 Sites programme should participate in capitalizing the resources for the Mediterranean. Mrs. Yang requested us to send her information.

Mrs. Yang, an expert on Asia, drew attention to the lack of resources in UNESCO and the Organization's inability to act to protect the sites most threatened as a result of the non-interference principle.

1.   She considers that the criteria used to draw up the original World Heritage Lists were too lax and that, in future, in order to be included in the List countries should demonstrate a genuine interest in protecting their heritage and the resources used for this purpose. The focus should be on cultural landscapes and proposals for large-scale projects.

2.   She is fully in favour of synergy among the various institutions and considers that one of the advantages of this process could be to help mobilize various European or international funds for the enhancement of world heritage sites, and that appeals should be made for private funds. UNESCO, for example, is closely following the Euromed Heritage programme and is working closely with UNEP/Tourism.

3.   She proposed joint publications (UNESCO/100 Sites) and an approach to the Tripoli Centre, which specializes in the legal aspects.

4.   She underlined the need to elaborate legal tools for protection and to establish management plans.

5.   She is in favour of the creation of a proper network directed not only at States but also at individuals, provided that it is accompanied by reaction and follow-up.

United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites programme

Evaluation report
Annex 4.4

Record of the interview with Mr. Aldo Iacomelli and Mr. Pietro Guerrieri, Ministry of the Environment, Rome, 12 June 2001

The two persons interviewed do not hold exactly the same point of view.

1.   Mr. Pietro Guerrieri expressed his concern at:

-       The possibility of integrating the 100 Sites Programme in MAP's activities;
-       The conflict between archaeological and environmental networks.

He stressed how "jealous" archaeologists were of their territory.

For these reasons, he believes that UNESCO should be given responsibility for dealing with historic sites and UNEP/MAP should be relieved of this task.

Mr. Guerrieri explained that he was opposed to the project because he considered that the resources allocated were insufficient to have a real impact, there was no critical mass, it was a "do-it-yourself" effort, and moreover the objectives were not clear. If it is a heritage matter, this is a cultural question not a MAP issue.

In addition, he considers that there are already too many networks.

2.   Mr. Aldo Iacomelli referred to the convention on the underwater heritage now being elaborated under the auspices of the United Nations in New York. He advised us to make an approach and integrate the programme into that framework.

He also noted that there had been a drift away from the original objectives, but he was in favour of the underwater heritage focus because **there were resources available** (and also of course because he is familiar with this subject). The questions that arise are: what to do, how, with whom and with what money? He expects us to provide the glimmer of an answer and, if it is satisfactory, he will follow. He underlined the need to develop **a well-defined programme**. In his view, the focal points should be relied on for support and should provide the culture/environment coordination. On the other hand, he is suspicious of the actions carried out by municipalities, which are more difficult to

circumscribe. It is necessary to define who will do what and at what cost. Too many structures are doing the same thing, even within MAP (Split, Tunis, Marseille).

In conclusion, a programme should be defined, activities developed and coordination with other international organizations put in place.

He would be in favour of a bulletin, provided that it was properly targeted, otherwise new objectives (sustainable development) and changing methods of little use, create an impetus. Call on the private sector.

United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites programme

Evaluation report
Annex 4.5

Record of the interview with Mr. Pietro Giovanni Guzzo, Curator of the site of Pompeii, 13 June 2001

The Curator gave us a warm welcome.

1.   Reputation of the Programme

He said that he had never heard of the 100 Sites Programme, but this did not surprise him as he was in contact with the Ministry of Culture and other culture-related bodies, but not with those concerned with the environment.

2.   Utility of the programme

He thought the idea of network of sites to allow the exchange of experience an interesting one. He would be greatly in favour of a bulletin, to be issued twice a year, well drafted and clearly targeted, to act as a link among site directors.

3.   The issues

The issues with which he is faced relate to management: enhancement of the site, matters related to the museum, dissemination of information, control of urbanism and tourism. Concern for the urban environment and the surroundings of sites and learn from the experience of others and their successes.

The problems to be tackled are either general, thematic, or regional. The major problems relate to the environment, pollution, the installation of hotels, pressure on the sites.

3.1   Land use planning

Primarily, the problems are those of land use planning. He mentioned in this connection the plan for a high-speed train on the Rome-Naples-Salerno line. If this metropolitan line stops in the station at Pompeii, the effects on the site could be significant, but also, if properly controlled, it could have a beneficial impact. This underlines the need for a long-term vision.

3.2   Sustainable development and the impact of tourism

Mr. Guzzo considers that the important issue in the context of MAP is sustainable development and the impact of tourism so the head of the Programme should be a "spearhead" to identify and mobilize the financing that exists. It is also important to mobilize opinion so as to promote awareness at all levels.

Approaches should be made to the World Bank, which is involved in cultural tourism.

3.3   Development of the surroundings

He cited the example of Herculaneum in particular. We ourselves had been extremely shocked at the mediocrity of the surroundings, and the smells coming from a poultry farm situated on the site's boundary. It appears that this farm is on the site's land which, unlike France, is administered by the Ministry of Finance. In order to derive profit from land that has not yet been excavated, it has been rented out to a farmer, without any agreement on standards. The surroundings of both Pomepii and Hercaulaneum are the responsibility of local representatives, who are only vaguely aware of cultural sensitivities.   Urbanism is the responsibility of the regions, which delegate to municipalities to a large extent. The guidelines are defined by the regions, but the "piani regulatori" (land-use plans) are put into effect by the municipalities.

Moreover, between the law and the practice, there is sometimes a wide gap. We noted, for instance, that the site's car park, just opposite the entrance, is a disaster from the point of view of the surroundings, the road signs, and advertising hoardings, which totally disfigure it. It is however a private car park. In this respect (protection of the environment and the surroundings), the Curator is relatively pessimistic because Italy apparently does not have any regulations on sites and landscapes.

4.   The structures

As regards the role of the Ministry of the Environment and its involvement in the Programme, he notes that the latter's concerns are often miles apart from and sometimes in conflict with those of the Ministry of Culture. He told us of a project for a sewage works on the site of a Bronze Age village, covering $60,000m^2$, authorization to excavate $10,000m^2$ was given, but it was only possible to excavate $1,000m^2$.

If there has to be coordination, it should be covered by an agreement between the country and the various ministers concerned.

United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites programme

Evaluation report
Annex 4.6

Record of the interview with Mr. Abdelaziz Daoulatli, historian, research scientist, former Director of the *Institut national du patrimoine* (Tunisia), 16 June 2001

At the request of PAP/RAC, Mr. Abdelaziz Daoulatli and Mr. Daniel Drocourt prepared the following document: "Guidelines for knowledge, safeguarding, planning and management of historic sites of common Mediterranean interest". UNEP/MAP, Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Culture and Communication, and the Environment (France), *Atelier du Patrimoine* of the city of Marseille, January 1989.

The interview with Mr. Daoulatli focused on the appraisal of this document in order to assess its scope and limits 12 years later.

1.   According to Mr. Daoulatli, the objective of the 1989 guidelines was to outline the action to be undertaken by MAP in order to obtain the institutional and financial resources.

2.   In response to the question of whether it was necessary to initiate a special programme for the Mediterranean under the aegis of UNEP when there was already a World Heritage Committee, Mr. Daoulatli said that UNEP, through MAP, bases its action on the concept of **integrated protection**, the heritage being a component and/or a social and economic development factor. UNESCO bases its action on protection of cultural and/or natural property of outstanding universal value *per se*. The objectives and methods of the **protection** of universal values and of the **preservation** of the heritage are not the same, even though their results overlap. Consequently, UNESCO's world heritage strategy and UNEP/MAP's strategy are generally distinct, though complementary.

3.   At the time the document was drafted, at the end of the 1980s, the various site curators consulted laid emphasis on:

- ♦ Preventive measures to preserve the sites threatened more by socio-economic (tourism/urbanization) and environmental development than by the aging of the property as such;
- ♦ Upgrading the institutions responsible so that they have sufficient legal and financial resources to carry out their tasks.

To summarize, before acting on the site itself, institutions have to be restructured and given adequate human resources, with special attention being paid to training.

4.   The upgrading of institutions should go hand-in-hand with a land planning policy that allows the heritage **to be integrated** in the development process.

5.   Mr. Daoulatli put at our disposal the "Report on the status of conservation of the world heritage in Arab States" (World Heritage 24 com WHC-2000/Conf.204/7, Paris, 16 November 2000), of which he is the author together with Hadi Saliba. The following paragraph taken from the conclusions will be of use in the evaluation of the MAP 100 Historic Sites Programme:

> In view of the present periodic reports, which are the first since the implementation of the World Natural and Cultural Heritage Convention 20 years ago, the Committee's attention will undoubtedly be drawn to the lacunae and problems of various sorts to which the authors have drawn attention in all honesty and transparency. This is the case for many projects in the World Heritage List. It clearly underlines the credibility of the majority of the reports, but cannot fail to raise some doubts, whether or not legitimate, regarding properties that have not been the subject of a report or of a report sent in very late (in Algeria: the Algiers Casbah, the Mzab Valley and the Tassili N'Ajjer;   in Tunisia: the Medina at Sousse and Ichkeul Lake; in the Sultanate of Oman, Bat-al-khutm (three sites in one entry); and in Mauritania: the Aguin Bank). These are seven sites out of the 44 included before 1993.

In these circumstances, it goes without saying that, in future, priority should be given to the ongoing and close monitoring of the situation in properties already listed as the precarious situation of a large number of them (in the opinion of the authors of the reports themselves) is evident. The Committee will probably have to revise its policy in order to take into account the imperative need to intervene in order to encourage the corrective action necessary and to respond to the expectations of those responsible for the property.

A revision could encourage programmes and budgets aimed at promoting better targeted and more diversified training, better understanding of the situation of property and its needs, more detailed planning, better integration within regional development policies, preventive conservation, more effective follow-up and, lastly, more familiarity with the Convention and its implications. In order to achieve this, the Committee will probably have no other choice but to encourage States parties to limit even more the already large number of new properties to be included and to devote the major part of their efforts and resources to preserving and enhancing sites that were listed some time ago and which require more care and attention.

6.   Under what conditions should the MAP/100 Sites Programme continue?

In reply to this question, Mr. Daoulatli recalled that, in the mid 1980s, there was talk of integration but since then the concept of sustainable development has become more widespread and established. There should therefore be an ideological re-focusing that would lead to the elaboration of new terms of reference.

United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites programme

Evaluation report
Annex 4.7

Record of the interview with Mr. Adel Hentati, in charge of SPA/RAC Tunis, and Mr. Chedli Raïs, engineer, fisheries expert at SPA/RAC, Tunis, 16 June 2001

The interview focused on two issues:

♦ The functioning of the *Atelier du Patrimoine*;
♦ Relations with Contracting Parties.

1.   Mr. Hentati drew attention to the problems encountered by the *Atelier* in becoming integrated within the MAP structure. He considers that this is because its position vis-à-vis PAP/RAC and subsequently SPA/RAC is not clearly defined. The *Atelier* is shown on the organizational chart, however, as the Secretariat of the 100 Historic Sites Programme.

2.   Mr. Raïs underlined the difficulty of dealing with the issue of historic sites within the framework of diversity, which is the major issue for the specially-protected areas.

3.   Mr. Hentati emphasized that SPA/RAC has drawn up a directory of natural sites, but it was unable to do the same for cultural sites because it did not have the necessary competence.

4.   He pointed out that certain countries, even though they had signed the SPA/RAC Protocol, would prefer to see the issue dealt with by UNESCO.

5.   In his view, the objectives in respect of the Mediterranean's cultural heritage should be identified so that SPA/RAC could sub-contract them to the 100 Historic Sites Secretariat, which should be re-structured. He noted that there was a commitment to integrate the cultural dimension into MAP and, if necessary, an appropriate protocol should be drawn up to allow the 100 Sites Secretariat to have a dual function, MAP and UNESCO (as REMPEC is organized jointly by MAP and IMO).

6.   Mr. Hentati also notes that the expression "100 Historic Sites of common interest" is unfortunate and it would be preferable to seek a title that refers to the cultural identity of the Mediterranean in order to underline the originality of the process, whose goal is sustainable development in relation to the globalization process.

7.   He said that the *Atelier* finds it difficult to operate in a network. In his view, it is essential to find an institutional formula that would allow different experts to work together at the level of Mediterranean sub-regions.   He hopes that South-South cooperation will be activated and, for this purpose, suggests that a conditionality clause on the exchange of expertise among Southern Mediterranean countries be included in European funding projects.

United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites programme

Evaluation report
Annex 4.8

Record of the interview with Mr. Jean-Claude Gondard, Secretary General of the City Hall of Marseille, 27 June 2001

1.   Action by the *Atelier du Patrimoine*

Mr. Gondard considers that the *Atelier du Patrimoine* constitutes a remarkable tool and the involvement of its Director, Daniel Drocourt, in the 100 Historic Sites Programme has been decisive. He cannot be reproached with personalizing its action because this is inherent in his task: if there had been no strong personal involvement on the part of Daniel Drocourt, nothing would have happened. Judging by the amount of data collected, a great deal of work has been done in gathering information and classifying data. On the other hand, the Programme does lack clearly defined guidelines and the choice of the 100 Sites essentially concerns the archaeological heritage so, at the outset, the structure was adapted to the task.

2.   Refocusing of the objectives

If the objectives are to be refocused on sustainable development (the interaction between the natural and cultural heritage and the environment in its threefold dimension – natural, social and cultural), the city of Marseille is perfectly ready to follow this new direction. It has indeed been decided to participate in the elaboration of a Charter of Quality of Life and in the agendas 21. Such action would therefore be fully in harmony with this decision. In addition, as Mrs. Reynaud mentioned, the city is very involved in intra-Mediterranean cooperation.

3.   Refocusing of the working methods

Mr. Gondard agrees it is necessary to set up a proper network among those responsible for sites, to implement multinational cooperation, with the support if need be of other Mediterranean cities, to seek funds from international donors and to facilitate access by countries of the South to such funds. He realizes that this means a particular type of organization and solid logistical backing. The human resources to be sought should no longer be solely heritage experts.

4.   A well-defined programme

Although it is ready to become involved, the city would like MAP to define the new direction clearly, its objectives, the resources to be made available by the various participants, and these elements should be the subject of common agreement.

5.   The structure

Moving in this new direction, the *Atelier du Patrimoine* should continue to provide support on topics such as well-defined cooperation issues within its competence and to contribute to developing the network, but it is clear that it is no longer a support structure adapted to the new objectives.

Mr. Gondard mentioned the possibility of approaching the *Institut de la Méditerranée*, an association directed by Professor J.-L. Reiffers, which is financed by four bodies (Regional Council, General Council, city of Marseille, and the Chamber of Commerce) and has a solid infrastructure.

**United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites Programme**

**Evaluation report
Annex 4.9**

**Record of the interview with Mrs. Isabelle Longuet, International Action Service,
Ministry of Culture (France), 28 June 2001**

---

1.   Involvement of the Ministry of Culture in the Programme

At the outset, the Ministry of Culture was not much involved in the Programme. Its officials, however, especially in the International Service, often met those involved in the 100 Sites Programme, particularly those in Tunisia.

Mrs. Longuet was only consulted on an official level when doubts were raised about the Programme and she took part in an interministerial meeting organized by the French Focal Point, Mr. Pujoulas, at the Quai d'Orsay.

2.   The Coordinator's action

Mrs. Longuet considers that Daniel Drocourt's image, both abroad and among French specialists, archaeologists in particular, is very negative. The impression is that the Programme, implemented without resources because Daniel Drocourt acts alone and makes little use of the municipal structure and without credits, has not led to any action and that the Coordinator has utilized the action for his own benefit. There has been no feedback of information, nor any report on the action. In addition, the fact that Mr. Drocourt has several roles leads to confusion among those contacted that is prejudicial. Lastly, he has not made any proposals for concrete action nor stimulated any achievements. At present, in the field, he is totally discredited, both in France and abroad.

3.   Non-existence of a network

Information has never really circulated among participants. It would nevertheless be desirable to set up proper cooperation and the circulation of information among all the bodies dealing with the Mediterranean heritage.

4.   Utilization of European or multinational financing

Daniel Drocourt has contacts with many different international bodies and was particularly well placed to mobilize multinational financing, especially at the European level, but he did not do so.

What is expected of this type of project is precisely to help countries and persons in charge of sites to prepare financing proposals within a European context. This was not the case, however, even though a considerable amount of financing was available for programmes such as the 100 Sites.

Mrs. Longuet regrets that Daniel Drocourt was appointed an expert for Euromed Heritage II. France was against this because he had been very partial and very negative and did not support any project submitted by his colleagues.

5.   Structure

Mrs. Longuet had tried to involve the Region PACA in the Programme in order to overcome the problems, but did not receive a favourable response.

**United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites Programme**

**Evaluation report
Annex 4.10**

Record of the interview with Mrs. Emmanuelle Leblanc, International Action Service, Ministry of Culture (France), 4 July 2001

1.   *Mrs. Leblanc considers that it is indeed necessary to refocus the Programme on sustainable development, the most important aspects being the impact of tourism and urbanization, together with environmental factors (climate, pollution, earthquakes). New criteria will have to identified for this purpose.*

2.   *She also believes that it would be interesting to refocus action on a more limited number of sites that correspond to the criteria defined.*

3.   *Under those circumstances, the Atelier du Patrimoine structure will only be able to play an occasional role as a sub-contractor. It is, however, interesting that the city of Marseille still wishes to be involved.*

4.   *It is also necessary to establish a solid interactive network, which is currently lacking (although this is unfortunately not the only such case).*

5.   *She wonders for what reason the idea of establishing a proper regional centre has been excluded: the 100 Sites Programme has "the appearance of a RAC", but it is not one .. She considers that it is important to clarify MAP's structures, which are the result of history and vegetative stagnation. It is impossible to please everyone, so it is important to base oneself on simple and clear systems. The change in focus should provide the opportunity to start anew and, for her part, she is in favour of changing the Programme into a RAC.*

6.   *Nevertheless, the fact that for once the Focal Point is outside the Ministry of the Environment is interesting in her view and is an example that should be followed both in France and elsewhere. The coordination that was established between the three Ministries and ICOMOS during this review should be pursued. One of the Programme's problems is its interministerial and multidisciplinary nature, whereas the majority of the participants are the products of a single culture (biological diversity or archaeology). It is time to introduce social and economic aspects into environmental approaches and vice-versa. The Programme should provide the opportunity to innovate.*

7.   *Lastly, there should also be cooperation with Euromed and MEDA (SMAP).*

United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites Programme

Evaluation report
Annex 4.11

Record of the interview with Miss Ilhan Montacer, Assistant to Mr. Pierre Fontaine, French Focal Point for Eumedis, 5 July 2001

The French Focal Point had never heard of the 100 Sites Programme.

Set up in the context of the Barcelona Convention and designed to bridge the gap between Euro-Mediterranean partners in the area of new information and communication technologies, Eumedis is the largest project ever carried out by the European Commission in this sector.

Its objectives are:

• *To establish a network of Mediterranean Focal Points and to finance interconnection, based on the Internet, among European and Mediterranean research networks;*
• *To finance regional pilot projects in five sectors, including the cultural heritage and tourism (€ 7 million for each sector).*

Each proposal must be put forward by a Euro-Mediterranean consortium composed of entities from at least two countries in the European Union and a group of Mediterranean bodies comprising the largest possible number of Mediterranean partners.

The sponsor must be a public or private non-profit-making European body located in one of the Union's member States. Up to 80 per cent of the project's financing, over three years, is covered by MEDA.

The invitation to present projects was issued in March 2000 and the time limit for putting them forward was January 2001.

170 projects have been received for the five topics and they are currently being examined.

A second phase can only be launched after the first phase has been evaluated.

The 100 Sites Programme fully met the criteria and would have stood a good chance of being chosen if it had been able to mobilize a large number of site directors.

For example, the following could have been proposed: the establishment of the network, the creation of the site, the completion of technical data sheets using CAD and photogrammetry, the preparation of documents for the public, CAD-based visualization of planning projects, etc, etc.

A valuable opportunity has been lost!

United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites programme

Evaluation report
Annex 4.12

Record of the interview with Mr. Francesco Acosta Sota, Directorate General of External Relations, European Commission, in charge of the Euromed Heritage programme, 11 July 2001

---

1.   The Euromed Heritage programme

The 100 Historic Sites Programme's concerns are the same:

  ♦ Promotion of awareness and knowledge of the heritage among decision-makers and the public;
  ♦ Institutional support for heritage protection and promotion policies;
  ♦ Development of human resources;
  ♦ Development and enhancement of the heritage, the issue of sustainable development.

Large amounts of money are involved (Phase I - €17 million; Phase II €40 million), he considers that if the 100 Sites Programme had been well presented it would have stood a good chance. A good opportunity has been lost.

2.   100 Sites and MAP

Mr. Acosta had never heard of the 100 Sites. Surprised at the technical nature of the two subjects dealt with, he expressed doubts about integration within MAP, but agreed that it would useful to set up a network of those responsible for sites and decision-makers for the purpose of tackling heritage problems in relation to sustainable development issues.

3.   Incompatibility

The roles of Coordinator of the project and of expert are totally incompatible. This is no doubt why Daniel Drocourt, who agreed to be an expert for both programmes, was unable to put forward the case. It is very regrettable.

4.   Euromed Heritage, Phase III

There will perhaps be a Phase III, so it is necessary to be prepared. It would be in

2003/2004. Mr. Acosta Soto wishes to remain in contact to see whether any synergy is possible with the programmes carried out, to make use of the results and, perhaps, prepare the follow-up or guide the activity towards other funding sources. Nothing prevents MAP becoming part of an existing programme, provided that it brings financial or technical added value.

United Nations Environment Programme
Mediterranean Action Plan
100 Historic Sites programme

Evaluation report
Annex 4.13

Record of the interview with Mr. Luxen, Secretary General of ICOMOS International, and Mrs. Consuelo Leon, his assistant (Brussels), 12 July 2001

1.   The Secretariat

Daniel Drocourt was the French representative on the Executive Committee of ICOMOS, but it did not appear desirable to renew his appointment, not for reasons of competence, which is recognized, but because he is unable to work in a team, does not feed back information and does not furnish any written document, which is contrary to the functioning of a network. Furthermore, he only speaks French, which raises a problem in an international organization.

2.   Continuation of the Programme

Mr. Luxen hopes the programme will continue, provided that it no longer has a specialized technical focus and opens up to problems related to tourism and historic towns. He is fully prepared to assist this process.

3.   Partnerships

Many organizations are involved in these issues. It would be interesting to approach entities such as the World Tourism Organization, UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICROM, the Council of Europe, the Aga Khan Trust, the Arab League, AVEC (Alliance of European Cultural Cities).

The European Commission has initiated many related programmes (ERDF, Article 10), LEADER, INTERREG, HEREIN, which are only open to European countries, but also special Mediterranean programmes, for example, Euromed Heritage, Eumédis, SMAP, Europolis, IncoMed (Research), the latter will be launching a new programme in 2002. Another research programme will be initiated by the Research Directorate General in 2003, namely, cities of tomorrow and the cultural heritage (the most recent phase, from 1998 to 2002, mobilized €178 million).

4.   Euromed Heritage

It is highly regrettable that this Programme, which has mobilized so much money, could not be used to set up the network and initiate concrete action. It is essential to evaluate the achievements, utilize what has been done, and to associate existing structures with the 100 Sites Programme when they function satisfactorily.

Several programmes warrant attention.[73]

5.   Tools

What tools are needed to operate the network? A liaison bulletin, an Internet site in three languages, new technologies. The appointment of an expert in new technologies and media coverage would be useful to the team.

6.   Structures

Mr. Luxen considers that, together with the MAP structures, outside bodies should be associated in a technical committee, and there should be a monitoring committee with limited membership (three Northern Mediterranean countries and three from the South), echoing the words of Mr. Nabli in this respect.

---

[73] See Annex 4.12, Record of the interview with Mr. Acosta Soto.