



# Approaches to Managing Urban Transformation for Historic Cities

HERBERT STOVEL\*

## PURPOSE

This paper is intended to look at the ways in which we define and examine management performance for historic cities, in the context of the current World Heritage nomination submitted by Macao. It attempts to identify relevant indicators of management performance by reviewing considerations important in a number of complementary perspectives available for appreciating and understanding transformation in historic cities.

## INTRODUCTION

Part of the evaluation process for a World Heritage nomination for Macao will be an assessment of the adequacy of the management and legal measures in place to protect and sustain its “outstanding universal value”.

As readers may understand, inscription of a site on the World Heritage List involves demonstrating two main things:

1. the qualities of a site, that is, those that give it “outstanding universal value”, as debated in the discussions yesterday morning in looking at Macao’s cultural significance, and its identity, looked at together with the modifying conditions of authenticity and integrity, and,

2. the need to demonstrate that the State Party is committed to protection.

While evidence of commitment to protection has been an inscription requirement for World Heritage since 1978, this concern has been taken much more seriously in the last decade – certainly for cultural properties – than in the first fifteen years of the Convention’s active life. In the case of Macao, establishing management adequacy presents unusual challenges. It is my understanding that the World Heritage nomination for Macao consists of twelve separate monuments or monument zones within the historic urban core. It won’t be enough for the World Heritage Committee to see management adequacy demonstrated at each of the twelve sites; rather, ICOMOS and the Committee would normally be looking for evidence that the management approach to the nomination ensures that the separate properties are managed according to common standards, and shared objectives. Hence they will be looking at the nature of the overall management system in place for the urban core within which the nominated zones exist.

Concerns involved in strengthening management for World Heritage sites should also be relevant to those seeking to improve general management of Macao’s heritage, for the benefit of its citizens, irrespective of the success of the World Heritage nomination. A number of the papers in this meeting look at ways in which these improvements can be achieved. For example, Ferdinand Lamarca yesterday introduced us to the concept of a “vision” as a management tool helping define where a city may want to be in future – a sort of “destination” concept, and he also showed us the importance of including concern for heritage within that vision statement. I would add to what Fernando said, and suggest that it is also important to include words in the vision statement which say something about *how* to arrive at the destination, a characterization of the nature of appropriate strategies for change.

---

\* B.Arch., McGill University (Montreal, Canada); M.Sc. Environmental Conservation, Heriot-Watt University (Edinburgh, Scotland). Director of ICCROM’s Heritage Settlements Unit, Rome. Secretary-General ICOMOS 1990-93.

*Bacharelato em Arquitectura pela Universidade McGill (Montreal, Canadá); Mestrado em Ciências de Conservação Ambiental pela Universidade Heriot-Watt (Edimburgo, Escócia). Director da ICCROM’s Heritage Settlements Unit, em Roma. Secretário-Geral da ICOMOS 1990-93.*

## PATRIMÓNIO II

At any rate, in the World Heritage context, with increasing interest in rigorous application by the Committee of the commitment to “protection”, have come varying interpretations of what requirements must be met to satisfy this commitment. In the most recent Committee meeting (Budapest, Hungary, June 2002)), a number of States Parties insisted that these requirements could only be met through the existence of a “management plan”.

This is becoming a difficult area in operation of the Convention, one frequently misunderstood and misinterpreted. There are a number of problems with an exclusive insistence on management plans, particularly in a World Heritage context, as an indicator verifying protection adequacy for cultural heritage properties.

First, it is important to recognize that this is not a formal requirement of the Committee’s *Operational Guidelines* (that is, by the procedural document which guides the Committee toward practical implementation of the World Heritage Convention) for cultural heritage properties. The *Operational Guidelines*, for cultural heritage properties, state that “*Each property nominated should .....have adequate legal and/or traditional protection and management mechanisms to ensure the conservation of the nominated cultural properties or cultural landscapes. The existence of protective legislation at the national, provincial or municipal level and/or a well-established contractual or traditional protection as well as of adequate management and/or planning control mechanisms is therefore essential .....Assurances of the effective implementation of these laws and/or contractual and/or traditional protection as well as of these management mechanisms are also expected.*” (Article 24.b.ii)

More importantly, suggesting that the adequacy of management can be verified by demonstrating the existence of a management plan, without reference to the actual impact or effectiveness of management measures within the plan is obviously misplaced. The mere existence of particular planning instruments such as management plans provides no qualitative assessment whatsoever of the effectiveness of related conservation measures. Measuring the state of conservation of a site and its environment, and the effectiveness of conservation policies, strategies and actions requires efforts to define in advance what is important to treat in protecting the site’s essential

heritage character. What will be judged important will vary from site to site and will require a process of examination of values and circumstances that will produce a checklist of significant factors to look at, defined uniquely for each particular site. All of these factors will be carefully defined within an effective management system, which may or may not include a management plan.

Thirdly, it is clear that while the application of formal management instruments, such as the management plan, may be entirely appropriate in some cases, e.g., for sites in the hands of a single management authority, in most cases, where management responsibility is dispersed, the appropriate management approach will include an array of co-ordination mechanisms attempting to align action around perceptions of shared objectives.

This paper attempts to demonstrate the need to look beyond the mere presence of formal management instruments or controls as indicators of management effectiveness, to the need to understand historically the truly significant transformational indicators and characteristics important in decision-making for an historic city’s heritage values to remain intact.

#### PARELLEL INITIATIVES: MONITORING ANALYSIS FOR WORLD HERITAGE

The results of efforts to focus on the characteristics of effective site management converge with the conclusions emerging from recent explorations of monitoring for the benefit of World Heritage sites. While the UNESCO World Heritage Secretariat began to look at the need for monitoring systems in the middle 1980s, only since the early 1990s have discussions begun to look systematically at the nature of desirable monitoring tools and indicators for measuring changes to the so-called “state of conservation” of inscribed properties. (ICCRUM with support from ICOMOS has begun to codify these systems in a “Monitoring Reference Manual” for World Cultural Heritage sites, to be made available early in 2003). In the last several years, a number of international meetings on the development of indicators for historic cities, have clarified that the key methodological questions here have less to do with “how” to monitor (for example, what indicators to use), than with “what” to

## HERITAGE II

monitor: what are the key subjects or themes which need to be examined closely, and for which indicators need to be developed?

#### IDENTIFYING KEY THEMES AND ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED BY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Hence if we can agree that it is important in assessing management adequacy to ensure that management plans, formal management instruments or other management mechanisms are designed to respond to key themes or issues needing priority treatment, and for which we can attempt to establish useful indicators for monitoring management effectiveness, then we can begin to ask how we can best identify such themes and issues. One starting point might be the recent history of conservation activity within historic cities and lessons gleaned from successful approaches to urban conservation.

#### OVERVIEW OF RESULTS OF RECENT CONSERVATION EFFORTS FOR HISTORIC CITIES

An overview of efforts to safeguard historic cities over the last thirty-five years does not provide great confidence in the overall effectiveness of the many measures introduced for protecting urban heritage. This period – the era of modern conservation we might say – which began with the creation of ICOMOS, ICCROM, and the UNESCO instruments focussed on cultural heritage (the UNESCO International Campaigns of the 1960s, and the 1972 World Heritage Convention) has seen a range of very serious efforts to strengthen capacity for urban conservation. Several hundred international and regional meetings have resulted in resolutions, declarations, recommendations, charters and meeting reports which have identified principles intended to guide decision-making towards greater respect for the heritage values of historic cities. These meetings and the efforts of those responsible for management of historic cities have also resulted in the development of many innovative approaches to heritage management in historic cities: historic building inventory and classification systems, master plans and conservation plans intended to guide use and development in

heritage sensitive directions, systems of grants and incentives tied to careful treatment of historic buildings.

While these measures have undoubtedly strengthened efforts to retain historic buildings and street patterns in many particular contexts, at the same time, we can recognize that they have proved inadequate in other contexts. In the end, we can realize that it is not the charters or the conservation tools *per se*, that ensure conservation, it is political will. For example, while most historic towns, cities and villages in Italy for example have retained their historic cores in meaningful ways, in neighbouring Greece, most historic centres subject to tourism or other development pressures have rapidly lost their historic qualities. If we stand back to assess the overall effectiveness of our collective efforts, it is difficult not to recognise that in many regions, we continue to be at risk of slowly losing the battle for retention of the heritage values of our historic cities. For every success – for every Rome, for every Santiago de Compostela, for every Vigan, for every Malacca – there are many examples of slow but inexorable failure.

#### THE SITUATION IN ASIA

This seems particularly true in Asia. There are many examples of Asian historic cities overwhelmed by the forces of contemporary change and development, and this often in spite of considerable efforts to promote conservation. Probably no historic city in the world has received more international missions, supported more expert analysis or received more expert recommendations than the Kathmandu Valley, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979. Yet the rate of loss, particularly in the Kathmandu City part of the complex seven component inscription is such that the World Heritage Committee, in response to out-of-control development in many sectors of the inscribed site, must now content itself with discussions aimed at reducing the size of the inscribed zone. In effect, the Committee has recognized the limited capacity of the present government and Nepalese civic society to enact measures which will protect all of its World Heritage values.

## PATRIMÓNIO II

This negative drift is confirmed in a paper prepared by the World Heritage Centre following the Suzhou (China) Conference of April, 1998 (“International Conference for the Mayors of Historic Cities in China and the European Union”). On page 3, the paper notes that *“if the monuments or groups of buildings are not directly threatened by pollution (e.g. Taj Mahal), then [they are] are at risk with ill-planned roads or railways to be constructed cutting across cultural sites (e.g., Hue, Viet Nam; Kyongju, Republic of Korea; Bagan, Myanmar, etc); or, through underground parking or subway tracks being planned for construction without any prior archaeological research (e.g., Esfahan, Iran). Public works for utilities extension and widening of inner-city roads have also led to demolitions of entire ensembles of historic building and irreversibly changing the urban historic morphology, (eg. in some historic cities in China), while unauthorized demolitions and reconstructions of historic buildings and construction of new ill-designed buildings incongruous to the spirit of the place (e.g., Kathmandu Valley, Nepal and elsewhere) have also caused damages beyond repair.”*

The same paper goes on to note on page four that *“the realities of Asian cities are determined by the need to accommodate for the even faster pace than in the past, of rural to urban migration, and to find urgent solutions to the deteriorating urban environment marked by insalubrious housing, insufficient supply of safe running water and inadequate sanitation systems, unemployment, under-employment, rampant urban poverty giving rise to crime...”*

The Nara Seminar on the “Development and the Integrity of Historic Cities” of March, 1999 similarly identified a number of major issues which have an “adverse effect on the conservation and maintenance of the historic fabric” in conserving *“the special historic character of historic cities in Asia:*

- *degradation in the quality of life of the inhabitants resulting from excessive pressures due to rapid urbanisation*
- *depopulation of small and secondary cities weakening their social and economic viability*
- *changes in the way of life which have led to new requirements in housing and services*
- *focus on the conservation of single monuments*
- *over-emphasis on the catering for the demands of tourism*

– *neglect of the inter-relationships between the historic areas, the wider urban context and the rural hinterland.”*

#### ALTERNATIVE FRAMEWORKS FOR REVIEWING MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS

If then, an historic retrospective directed at the evolution of contemporary conservation practice does not seem to yield proven practices effective in urban management, then we will have to look elsewhere to find alternative means of understanding – and therefore guiding – urban transformation towards greater respect for heritage values.

Several alternative perspectives may be useful in carrying out this search:

- Many of the historic cities we persevere to save with our modern instruments and methods arrived as objects of preservation interest after several centuries – even millennia – of evolution during which those conservation instruments were absent. What can we understand of the forces guiding changes during those past centuries that we can build into present practice?
- Many contemporary historic cities are immensely satisfying for visitors in their ability to continually change and mutate without impairing their heritage values. What appear to be the key factors being respected in guiding change over time in such successes, at least as seen from the viewpoint of external visitors?
- Cities change as the result of hundreds and thousands of decisions made inside and outside of formal and informal decision-making frameworks. In essence, conservation success appears to have more to do with the ability of historic cities to manage these processes of “dynamic” change, than the effectiveness of the “static” protective instruments (lists, inventories, prohibitions, supports and incentives) normally employed within the conservation community. It is worth asking to what extent we can identify and describe the nature of the dynamic development processes which best contribute toward realisation of conservation objectives.
- Many contemporary historic cities, concerned about developing sensible and ethical approaches

## HERITAGE II

to city development, which offer quality of life to their citizens and optimize use of available resources, now commit themselves to management visions which can support retention of historic resources. Examples would be cities which may choose to adopt policies promoting “sustainability”, “ecological soundness”, “liveability” or “risk sensitivity” etc.

Let’s look at each of these four perspectives in turn.

*FIRST, learning from historic transformational impulses in cities.*

Analysis of a number of the forces which have encouraged sympathetic change in historic cities over time may offer useful insights.

We all recognize that some historic cities appear to go through centuries, even millennia of change and arrive in today’s world, their heritage values intact. It is attractive to try to understand the nature of these processes in ways which would allow us to extract lessons useful in urban conservation. I say “attractive” but probably futile, in the light of the our radically changed circumstances – given rapidly increasing rates of technological and industrial change, given rapid urbanisation, given escalating patterns of consumption, given globalisation and so on – all of which seem to call out today for artificial controls or limits on development, to save what time has conferred on us.

Let’s look nevertheless at some of the forces influencing change over time in historic cities:

- For most of history, limited rates of technological change have ensured that successive generations did not work or build in forms, materials or methods substantially different from those of preceding generations. Only in this century have we moved from full dependence on artisanal production and use of traditional building materials to widespread industrial production, and felt impelled to invent artificial conservation instruments to retain both evidence and use of earlier technologies.
- A second relevant force may be strong economic pressures to recycle within earlier historical eras, favouring the husbanding of physical heritage materials. While in today’s world, new buildings

in urban contexts generally are constructed following the complete removal of the older structure, in earlier times, the relative difficulty and cost of finding and transporting materials stimulated efforts to retain or re-use these materials in one way or another. A close look at ancient Rome for example, shows the widespread practice of using older buildings as “quarries” of raw material for installation in new buildings. Demolition occurs but without any self-conscious effort to conserve, and selected materials are re-integrated into the evolving urban fabric.

- A commitment to the retention of surviving materials frequently implied retention and re-use of appropriate ancient forms again evident in many historic cities. If I may continue to use my home city of Rome as an example, (and Prof. Christina Cheng earlier described Macao as the Rome of the East, so perhaps the comparisons are not so far-fetched), it is possible to recognize that the plan form of today’s Piazza Navona echoes the plan of the Roman era stadium that preceded it. The network of streets around the Campo dei Fiori echoes the plan and surviving vestiges of the Teatro dei Pompeii. The structure of many a Roman temple underlies or is imbedded within a Renaissance Church. The three-nave form of the Christian church echoes the Basilican Law courts of Roman times. And so on.

Cities that have retained tangible traces of their past in their archives and in the memories of citizens are able to meaningfully recover vanished patterns and structures. Nowhere is this more evident than in the current rebuilding of Berlin. The *Financial Times* of Aug. 3, 2002 reports that “the historic face of the city is re-emerging after the years of gloom”. In nearby Potsdam, “one of the town’s famous canals – covered since the war – had been redug...and the gateway to the Town Palace, detonated in 1960, had been re-erected”. The report continued that “the rest is to follow, which will mean relaying the roads...removing an ugly skyscraper...and [rebuilding] the Garrison Church...the spiritual centre of Prussia, which fell victim to the reigning ideology as late as 1968.” While some would question the resulting authenticity of efforts to reconstruct lost Berlin, as in many other Eastern and Central capitals, it is not



## PATRIMÓNIO II

difficult to accept the arguments made for the need for new symbols of lost – and now re-acquired – statehood.

While we can't afford to romanticize any of these observations, they can suggest some criteria useful in assessing contemporary management effectiveness in historic cities.

In summary, what might be some of the areas in which urban conservation indicators might usefully be established in relation to this evolutionary perspective?

**1. *A well managed historic city will maintain and strengthen its craft traditions.***

Assessment should look at the degree to which traditional craftsmanship and related support systems have been sustained and made available to strengthen maintenance of the existing and a base for contemporary expression

**2. *A well managed historic city will ensure contemporary planning efforts which reflect traditional patterns and layouts.***

Assessment should look at the degree to which contemporary planning and design is based on efforts to understand and to meaningfully re-employ existing urban forms, building vestiges and patterns

*SECOND, learning from qualities which make historic cities attractive and appealing to residents and visitors.*

Those who move through and experience historic cities are drawn to a range of qualities. These qualities have something to do with the integrity of the visitor experience and equally, something to do with their sense of confidence in the provisions made for the security of the site.

In the former case, these qualities have to do with the quality of communication between visitor and site. People search out contact with the real, the genuine; they search for believable, and credible testimonies of the stories or messages they find important; they seek ways to be in touch with the movement of time through the physical space of the city.

In the latter case, these qualities have to do with perceptions concerning the internal health of a site. People are attracted by evidence of the essential wellness, the good condition of a site, by evidence of commitment of citizens to care for the site, by the security of

confidence in the likely survival of what they see and experience.

The World Heritage Committee has developed a mechanism to try to bring perception of both concerns into their analysis in a consistent and systematic way. The Committee uses the concept of “qualifying conditions” to address this issue. “Qualifying conditions” are factors important in analysing the genuineness, the intactness, the wholeness of its core values: what the Convention calls “Outstanding Universal Value”. Two of these “qualifying conditions” have been explicitly recognized during the life of the Convention: for cultural heritage, the “test of authenticity”, and for natural heritage, the “conditions of integrity”. (The *Operational Guidelines* state in Article 24, b, i, that cultural nominations must “*meet the test of authenticity in design, material, workmanship or setting and in the case of cultural landscapes their distinctive character and components*”).

*Authenticity*, defined as a measure of the degree to which the attributes of cultural heritage sites can be understood to genuinely, credibly, truthfully express the heritage values expressed by the attributes, may be seen in this way as a “qualifying condition”, a concept focussed not on the selection of values themselves, but on the clarity of communication of these values. *Integrity*, in similar fashion, may be understood as an indicator of the degree to which site conditions are appropriate for the protection of defined heritage values – again, a “qualifying condition”, a measure of the intactness of the environment necessary to support the core values.

How can we apply these “qualifying conditions” to understanding the health and conservation of our historic urban environments? Understanding *authenticity* as related to attributes of design, material, workmanship and setting (as in the existing *Operational Guidelines*), and extending this to include the concepts of tradition, and use (as in the proposed new *Operational Guidelines*, as derived from the Nara Document of 1994) suggests a range of useful questions. Will this proposed change maintain authenticity of setting? Of design (understood in urban terms as street layout and patterns)? Of function? Etc. If we begin to add in concern for *integrity* – for the intactness of surviving physical remains, for wholeness (for the integrity of the systems that sustain cities), we are given other important questions to ask. To what extent do proposed changes maintain intact relations between urban functions, layout and structures?

## HERITAGE II

The use of “integrity” as an operational concept useful for historic cities was explored in an Asian context during the meeting organised in Nara in March 1999, “Development and the Integrity of Historic Cities”. The seminar noted that the following factors together contribute to the “integrity” of the historic city (taken from page 2 of the World Heritage Committee report):

- *“intangible human activities linked to supporting physical features*
- *coherence of the historic area relating on the fusion of the components*
- *recognition that cities consist of a number of historical overlays*
- *recognition of significance which will vary from generation to generation*
- *links between socio-economic development, community welfare, and the conservation of historic character .”*

It now seems likely that the next edition of the *Operational Guidelines* will for the first time define “conditions of integrity” appropriate for cultural heritage.

These two concepts, authenticity and integrity, provide useful indicators of what spaces/ structures/ functions/ traditions etc. to keep or modify in historic cities and also of what might constitute respectful treatment of the urban fabric, layout and systems. Applying authenticity analysis to an historic city moves our attention well beyond the material or design elements to concern for dynamic qualities such as tradition and function. Bringing our attention to integrity also encourages us to examine the intactness of systems that support and sustain urban life. However, taken together these two concepts may not be enough to give a fully clear picture of the key indicators for maintaining the essential “character” or “sense of place” of an historic city.

A number of recent discussions have focussed on a third “qualifying condition”, one that may be of particular importance for historic cities – that of *continuity*. Christopher Pound, who is also contributing to this meeting, argues convincingly that continuity is indeed the key factor to focus on in sustaining historic urban character, in papers he has presented in other contexts. In a city like Rome, inscribed on the World Heritage List in the 1980s, the sense of continuity – a sense of timelessness – appears to be the factor most seized upon by visitors as giving meaning to their

observations. The ability to move through the “Eternal City” and to experience its many interwoven layers in every corner of the Centro Storico causes even lay observers to question the efforts of Mussolini in the 1930s to disinter the Roman Fora (now exposed flanking the Via dei Fori Imperiali) or the buried antiquities of the Largo Argentina, exposing interesting archaeological remains, but removing these spaces from the living use of citizens. While these romantic efforts to reclaim lost glories were common in the 30s – witness the excavations of the Greek agora in Athens, or of the historic centre in Kos in this period – and in all cases could only be accomplished by demolition of historic quarters of considerable significance, they seem to provide a somewhat empty testimony today, when viewed alongside the infinitely more complex and rewarding layers of adjacent neighbourhoods.

In summary, what might be some of the areas in relation to perceptions of the qualities of historic cities, for which indicators might usefully be established?

**3. *The attributes of a well managed historic city will authentically reflect its significant heritage values.***

AUTHENTICITY: Assessment here looks at the degree to which the attributes (design, material, setting, workmanship, function, traditions) of the historic city may be seen to reflect the significant heritage values of the historic city

**4. *A well managed historic city will maintain and strengthen the integrity of its components, its systems and the relationship between them.***

INTEGRITY: Assessment here looks at the degree to which wholeness and intactness of the historic city and its operating systems may be seen to be present

**5. *A well managed historic city will maintain and strengthen its sources of continuity.***

CONTINUITY: Assessment here will look at the degree to which continuity of form, layout, living traditions and patterns of use are present in the historic city

*THIRD, learning from the dynamic development processes which shape contemporary historic cities.*

Some of the most interesting and effective urban conservation programmes developed in the last several decades have concentrated on integrating

## PATRIMÓNIO II

concern for preservation of elements of urban heritage within overall economic development schemes.

Among the best known of these schemes are the so-called Main Street (or downtown revitalisation) programmes of North America. These programmes are designed to involve communities of business people and merchants in organised self-help action to improve the attractiveness of their commercial enterprises through development of marketing, design and economic development opportunities. These schemes have been enormously successful over twenty-five years in North America, exerting a positive influence in well over a thousand historic small towns and neighbourhoods. Here, ultimately historic buildings, storefronts and signs are seen as design assets in strengthening consistency and quality of business image and appeal. The shared effort underlying Main Street programme accomplishments ultimately reinvigorates civic pride in the identity and history of the community, and long-term support for community heritage as a key development resource.

Main Street programmes are organised around four key action points: organisation (bringing various communities to act together around shared objectives), economic development, design and marketing. The latter three are all subservient possible physical focuses for the shared efforts brought about by successful community organisation.

A second example is the emphasis to be found in Europe since the 1975 Amsterdam Charter (an agreement of European countries around means to strengthen architectural conservation) on *integrated approaches to urban conservation*. While initially interpreted in fairly mechanical terms as concerned with *integrated structures* in municipal planning (that is, creating a Heritage Conservation unit within municipal government for example), today integrated approaches are understood to imply *integrated processes*, ensuring decision-making builds in widespread involvement of all community interests in defining heritage values and appropriate levels and forms of care.

In both – and many more similar examples – the key ingredient in effective strategies has been the development of a bottom-up approach, building support at the grass root level for heritage conservation, support which ultimately generates the political will

and the economic will to bring about achievement of conservation goals.

In summary, what might be some of the areas in relation to dynamic processes for integrating urban heritage in development for which indicators might usefully be established?

6. ***A well managed historic city will ensure community participation in decision-making.***  
Assessment involves looking at the degree of involvement of the community in defining heritage values and in determining forms of appropriate care
7. ***A well managed historic city will support self-help strategies for its improvement.***  
Assessment involves looking at the degree to which planning promotes use of self-help policies and strategies in achieving conservation goals.
8. ***A well managed historic city will ensure its defined heritage values serve as the key reference in evaluating development options.***  
Assessment involves looking at the degree to which the values of the historic city serve as a core criterion in evaluating development options

*FOURTH, learning from contemporary visions for city growth sensitive to heritage concerns.*

Cities have been encouraged to explore alternative visions for their future development in the face of the many escalating pressures and forces confronting contemporary planners and managers: too-rapid urbanisation, uncontrolled suburban spread, increasing environmental degradation, increasing poverty and growing income gaps between rich and poor, just to name a few. Let's look at a few of the primary concerns addressed within these various vision formulations.

The Rio Summit of 1992 on Sustainable Development resulted in adoption of Agenda 21, a set of principles for sustainable development subsequently adopted by national governments and promoted within national, regional and local governments. While for the most part, these principles are concerned with limiting resource consumption, many deal directly with organisation for sustainability. For example, Agenda 21 promotes decentralized decision-making – moving authority from national to local levels – as a key means to ensuring that decision-making takes into account local perceptions and priorities, often more in tune



## HERITAGE II

with the resource implications and consequences of political decisions. Hence Agenda 21 states clearly that the most sustainable forms of local government are those where decision-making has been moved most closely to those most affected by the decisions. This applies strongly to those concerned with heritage decision-making as well.

Other international organisations have also promoted alternative visions of national or civic growth highlighting certain key objectives to be sustained in supporting equitable growth. The World Bank has exposed two broad thrusts in policies developed over the last five years, touching heritage conservation and economic development: heritage conservation as an instrument of *social inclusion*, and heritage conservation as an instrument of *poverty alleviation*. Currently World Bank programmes supporting heritage conservation (and there are many) are organised around the ability of programme officers to demonstrate benefits in terms of these social objectives.

Finally, the many floods occurring this year in the late summer in Eastern Europe and across Asia, particularly in China, have demonstrated the inadequacy of current measures for risk preparedness in many sites on the World Heritage List. Many sites, given the high nature of intrinsic internal risk relative to known local hazards (e.g., fire, earthquake, flood, fire) deserve greater commitment within management regimes to efforts to reduce sources and consequences of risk, and to explore the capacity of traditional construction technologies and practices to reduce risk.

All of these visions or components of visions in one way or another focus on promoting the quality of life of the citizens of the historic city. Effective integration of heritage conservation goals in long-term city development requires demonstrating the importance of placing concern for heritage within quality of life statements or visions defined for historic cities.

In summary, what might be some of the areas in relation to alternative visions for city growth for which indicators might usefully be established?

**9. *A well managed historic city will have mechanisms in place to strengthen decision-making at local levels.***

Assessment involves looking at the degree to which decision-making has been moved to the local level (and therefore the degree to which local

heritage interest has been strengthened and local ownership assured)

**10. *A well managed historic city will promote heritage conservation as an instrument of social inclusion.***

Assessment involves looking at the degree to which conservation policy and programmes promote social and cultural respect, mutual respect and sustained co-existence.

**11. *A well managed historic city will optimize retention of programme and project profits within the local community.***

Assessment involves looking at the degree to which development profits are retained within individuals and institutions within the local community

**12. *A well managed historic city will ensure high levels of risk preparedness in its institutions and municipal agencies.***

Assessment involves looking at the degree to which management regimes incorporate policies, strategies and programmes for improving risk preparedness

## CONCLUSION

The above dozen subject focuses are merely illustrative of possible subject areas for review for historic cities in assessing management effectiveness qualitatively, and indeed there could be many more. As well, the precise choice of subjects to be assessed will depend on the particular qualities of the historic city and the political, economic and social circumstances in which it is proposed to realize heritage objectives. Each community needs to debate its choice of the areas in which indicators are to be established, in the context of their particular circumstances, in building up effective management systems which will preserve their particular heritage values.

In the end, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the modern instruments invented by the public sector to protect urban heritage values have not proved fully adequate in the face of the economic, social and political forces confronting historic cities today. The efforts by the World Heritage Committee to verify management effectiveness are intended to promote use of mechanisms which can better protect the values of heritage cities from the negative impact of the many

## PATRIMÓNIO II

relentless external contemporary pressures now in place. This intention is not easy to bring to realisation. Even where historic centres survive, their values apparently intact, they often do so as oases surrounded by featureless and meaningless outlying areas serving more directly the needs of business, residents and industry. Heritage can become something set aside from community development instead of something at its core, and heritage advocates may find themselves promoting retention of values and fabric which appear irrelevant to the needs of most in society. The only way forward is to make the heritage debate public and to make the issues, the stakes and the options of high public relevance. With strong public awareness, comes support, and ultimately the political will necessary to sustain heritage goals. At this point, the management mechanisms will be relevant to the heritage goals defined.

When the Macao World Heritage nomination goes forward, scrutiny of the nomination will certainly

involve efforts by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee to verify the effectiveness of the management instruments in place. This paper encourages the organisers of this Conference, the citizens of Macao, and the professionals and administrators entrusted with the care of Macao, irrespective of the World Heritage nomination process now underway, to take up these questions for the better long term protection of the city's qualities: to constructively examine the management mechanisms in place, and to verify and debate choices of indicators which could give a clear picture about the effectiveness of management activity. To earn a place on the World Heritage List, or indeed simply to sustain its many heritage values for the benefit of its citizens, Macao needs to bring the attention of its citizens to the underlying forces and qualities which comprise its essential character, and to involve them in efforts to ensure that the city's planning and legal instruments are fully focussed on maintaining this character. **RC**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, March 1999, WHC.99/2.UNESCO.
2. *Report of The Nara Seminar on the "Development and the Integrity of Historic Cities"*, 5-7 March, 1999. Information document prepared for the World Heritage Bureau, Paris, July 5-10, 1999. WHC-99/CONF.204/INF.5, UNESCO.
3. *Report of the Suzhou (China) Conference - "International Conference for the Mayors of Historic Cities in China and the European Union"*. April 1998. Information document prepared for the World Heritage Committee, Kyoto, 30 November – 5 December, 1998. WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.12, UNESCO.
4. Giles Macdonough, "Fresh look at an historic face", Financial Times, "City Break Berlin", Aug. 3, 2002.
5. *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, Nov. 1994. Adopted by ICOMOS (1999). Consulted in US/ ICOMOS Scientific Journal, Volume 1, Number 1, 1999. "ICOMOS Charters and other international doctrinal documents".
6. *The Declaration of Amsterdam*, 1975. Congress on the European Architectural Heritage 21-25 October, 1975. Consulted in US/ ICOMOS Scientific Journal, Volume 1, Number 1, 1999. "ICOMOS Charters and other international doctrinal documents".