



ICOMOS GUIDANCE

on

**POST TRAUMA RECOVERY AND
RECONSTRUCTION**

for

WORLD HERITAGE CULTURAL PROPERTIES

This document is prepared by ICOMOS in response to the request for guidance on reconstruction expressed by a World Heritage Committee decision in 2016.

It should be regarded as the first version of a Working Document that will be tested, revised and refined through experience and reflection.

Paris - 2017

CONTENTS

PREAMBLE

Executive Summary

1. **GUIDANCE ON POST TRAUMA RECOVERY AND RECONSTRUCTION**
Context, Purpose and Scope of Guidance
2. **POST TRAUMA RECOVERY AND RECONSTRUCTION PROCESS**
A Framework for Action

FACTORS IN INHERITANCE AND TRANSMISSION

The Identification of Attributes of Outstanding Universal Value

First/early response

Review of impacts

Identifying and assessing options for recovery/reconstruction

Developing a Master Plan for the recovery of Attributes of OUV

Summary: the Framework for Recovery/Reconstruction

ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS

Identification of stakeholders

Clarity of organisational responsibilities

The deployment of expertise and skills

Effective use of resources

PREPAREDNESS

Risk Assessment and Disaster Response planning

Communication protocols

Embedding cultural heritage protection

Capacity building

SUMMARY: FRAMEWORK FOR POST TRAUMA RECOVERY AND RECONSTRUCTION

ANNEXES

Selected reference documents

Glossary of terms

PREAMBLE

Context

The background for issuing this document is set by the scale, persistence and nature of destructive events of recent times. These dramatic losses, the results of natural processes and human action, have renewed awareness of the vulnerability of our cultural inheritance - heritage which includes places whose attributes are of 'Outstanding Universal Value' (OUV) - and awareness of the commitment of the overall international community to the common purpose of preserving and transmitting it to future generations. The magnitude of natural disasters such as those that have affected Nepal, Cuba or Italy, and the destruction, whether intentional or not, caused by armed conflicts on sites in Syria, Iraq, Yemen, the former Yugoslavia and Mali among many others, create unprecedented challenges for recovery and possible restoration.

Conservation actions address partial destruction of properties and the fact that the events may affect areas that extend far beyond the properties protected through their World Heritage designations. The imperatives of transmission persist in each circumstance and have brought sharply into focus the variety of issues of reconstruction in damaged World Heritage properties in particular, most challengingly where these include areas or values that support living communities. In this context, the status of reconstruction of heritage within the broader framework of post-disaster recovery is established through reference to the accumulated experience of action and reflection.

Cultural heritage reconstruction

Within the discourse on heritage protection, reconstruction has long been considered in the context of restoration. At the heart of debate and practice has been the concern to prevent loss while avoiding damage and deceit. One can observe that statements of principles for conservation action have developed from reflection on experience and predictive modelling of societal needs. The authors of the Venice Charter of 1964 saw the urgent need for a fresh appraisal of the principles and approaches set out in Athens in 1931 (*Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments*). This early Charter, concerned with the destruction as well as the decay of monuments, could not have anticipated the scale of destruction and reconstruction occasioned by WWII. Similarly, as recovery took hold, it became necessary to address the impact of redevelopment on historic centres, to establish the essential elements of significance and the ethical basis for intervention. The Charter on urban conservation was adopted as the Washington Charter of 1987 (*Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas*), which was followed by the Vienna Memorandum of 2005 and most recently embodied in the Valletta Principles of 2011¹.

The reflection is ongoing and the world community now faces an equivalent task: how to address the multi-dimensional challenges of today, taking into account the understanding of cultural inheritance across civilisations which is embodied in the Nara Document of 1994 (*Nara Document on Authenticity*). It is now apparent that recovery from destruction cannot be understood as a single undertaking or programme, but involves processes and long-term commitments in which local populations, authorities and international bodies exercise critical roles. Milestones in this process can be seen in the reference documents listed in Annexe 1.

Further reflection and refinement continually introduce additional considerations. The involvement of inhabitants in ensuring the continuing life of cultural heritage receives cursory acknowledgement in the Athens Charter, is seen as important in the Venice Charter, and is strongly promoted in the Washington Charter. Understanding the interpenetration of tangible and intangible aspects of cultural heritage, especially in inhabited cultural environments, underlines the necessity for a new mind-set, one that perceives reconstruction as a set of processes, with high priority placed on sustainable development and active engagement of communities. Such considerations must underpin any framework for post trauma recovery and reconstruction.

¹ The Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas. Adopted by the 17th ICOMOS General Assembly on 28 November 2011

With respect to World Heritage properties

Within the World Heritage framework, in the spirit of the 1972 Convention, reconstruction has always been viewed from the perspective of 'Outstanding Universal Value' (OUV), that is, with a focus on its impact on the attributes that, under the various criteria, were integral to the OUV of the property, and thus on the basis for its inscription. For example, reconstruction has been accepted when supportive of OUV, in cases where reconstructions on the basis of detailed evidence were seen to give meaning to the designated landscape, or where intensive restoration and reconstruction were considered as a means of having an idealised image that could forge a national identity. Reconstruction has also been accepted in relation to sustaining the explicit or implicit attributes of OUV, not only in relation to fabric but also to processes, uses and associations, and in properties where the replacement of fabric responds to deterioration. In contrast, reconstruction has been rejected or considered inappropriate when seen as having an adverse impact on OUV, or where it involved interventions at archaeological sites that could have irreversible consequences on preservation conditions, future excavations and interpretation, and/or might be speculative in nature.

Taken together over the years, these determinations reflect the understanding that in the context of safeguarding and sustaining OUV, reconstruction can take many forms, which are not mutually exclusive and can exist in parallel. As a concept, reconstruction is complex rather than singular and can extend beyond the reconstruction of fabric. From this perspective, reconstruction can be about reinvigorating communities and fostering processes and associations, as well as restoring form, function or physical fabric, depending on the nature of the attributes and their role in conveying OUV. Reconstruction is a process that responds to particular situations and, in the case of World Heritage properties, to the specific attributes that convey OUV.

The Guidance document

This document is prepared in response to the concerns expressed by the World Heritage Committee in 2015. It relates to the importance of 'developing a post-conflict strategy, including the means of extending support for reconstruction of damaged World Heritage properties. This would be achieved through technical assistance, capacity-building, and exchange of best conservation and management practices. It addresses in particular the request for guidance on reconstruction expressed in the Committee decision of 2016². It was developed through, inter alia, the deliberations of an international workshop convened in Paris in September 2016³.

One must note that this guidance may be considered provisional in some respects, as it is elaborated in circumstances where the full effect of the catastrophic events of recent times has yet to be established. It is prepared for current use and in response to persistent and urgent requests for guidance. It should be regarded as the first version of a Working Document that will be tested, revised and refined through experience and reflection.

The document relates to the issues of post trauma recovery and the experiences of approaches that have been already been put into practice and have proved valid or acceptable in different instances. In full realisation of the many dimensions of trauma and recovery, the guidance relates to the concerns of the cultural heritage field and specifically that of World Heritage. It does not elaborate on the differing characteristics of destruction through natural and human causes. It acknowledges the particular challenges for those places where action is required to give back homes to communities and where the scale of the destruction is large and the level of information and documentation on what has been lost may be insufficient or almost non-existent. The document sees integration of cultural heritage protection within the broad framework of post trauma recovery actions across the spectrum of issues encountered.

Reconstruction in the World Heritage context involves a focus on the attributes that convey Outstanding Universal Value. At the same time it is expected that the framework set out in the document may have wider application and assist damaged heritage places in identifying a wide spectrum of possibilities for the future.

² Decision 40 COM7 (Istanbul, Turkey 2016): more in-depth reflection is needed on reconstruction within World Heritage properties as a complex multi-disciplinary process, and that consideration should be given to developing new guidance to reflect the multi-faceted challenges that reconstruction brings, its social and economic context, the short and long-term needs of properties, and the idea of reconstruction as a process that should be undertaken within the framework of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the properties.

³ The workshop was sponsored by Kyushu University, Japan, organised and hosted by ICOMOS.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Guidance document on post trauma recovery and reconstruction is focussed on cultural heritage concerns and specifically on World Heritage, while also acknowledging the wider social, environmental and economic factors which recovery must address.

The main body of the document is titled Post trauma Recovery and Reconstruction process: a Framework for Action. This outlines factors in inheritance and transmission, organisational factors and preparedness. Annexe 1 identifies key reference documents.

Annexe 2 provides a glossary of terms used in the document.

In summary, the Framework for Action is made up of the following elements:

- a Definition of material and immaterial attributes supporting OUV at the time of inscription or as subsequently established, with such elaborations in definition as may be required.
- b Documentation and recording of surviving and lost tangible and intangible attributes of OUV, establishing their post trauma status and identifying potential new attributes that support OUV.
- c Assessment of the impacts of events on the tangible and intangible attributes of OUV, incorporating the input of affected local, national and international stakeholders.
- d Development of a Statement of Impacts and Identification of Options for recovery of attributes with an assessment of the heritage impacts of actions under each option, leading to the identification of the preferred option.
- e The preferred option for recovery to be submitted for approval in principle by the World Heritage Committee. Rapid revision processes between World Heritage sessions should be considered.
- f Development of a Master Plan in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for the recovery of attributes, defining the objectives of recovery and reconstruction and specifying the approach to be taken to re-establishing attributes. For material assets and attributes it will indicate techniques, technologies and implementation provisions. For immaterial attributes it will specify provisions to monitor developments, foster community cohesion and sustainability and ensure viability of future uses.
- g Amendments to the Management Plan to reflect changes to attributes of OUV as appropriate.

GUIDANCE ON POST TRAUMA RECOVERY AND RECONSTRUCTION

Context, Purpose, Scope and Structure of the Guidance

1 Background

This Guidance document is prepared in the context of catastrophic events affecting diverse World Heritage properties, many of them experiencing new dimensions of intentional destruction and resulting accelerated decay. It reflects emerging views on heritage and its importance to the social and economic life of people and a growing awareness of culture and cultural heritage as drivers of sustainable development, and especially in post trauma circumstances, as an identity marker and a social cohesion factor.

In a wider context of heritage loss or depletion, the Guidance is focussed on World Heritage properties that, as a result of traumatic events, have lost part or all of those attributes that have been recognised as being of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), and where there is a desire, if not a quasi imperative, to recover what has been lost through some type of reconstruction.

2 Purpose

This Guidance, prepared in response to the 2015 initiative of the World Heritage Committee, aims to help relevant stakeholders affected by traumatic heritage destruction to assess damage to the explicit or implicit attributes supporting OUV. It sets out a framework for documenting impacts and evaluating options for the identification, re-establishment, recovery or possible restoration of attributes. In identifying processes to optimise preservation and recovery of attributes, this Guidance notes that widespread destruction may, but does not necessarily mean, the loss of OUV of properties inscribed on the World Heritage list. It recognises also that recovery actions and reconstruction may exacerbate destructive effects of traumatic events or on the contrary, in some cases contribute to creating new values.

3 Scope

All heritage assets including World Heritage properties must be understood in their cultural, material and historical contexts, and in both their tangible and intangible dimensions. While World Heritage properties are the primary focus of this Guidance, it is noted that destruction may impact, not only on the inscribed properties themselves, but also on their immediate and wider settings that support the attributes of their OUV. Such destruction applies also to the social, environmental and economic structures that underpin the persistence of cultures.

This Guidance sets out a framework within which thorough, informed and participative decision-making can be undertaken in the potential recovery of both tangible and intangible attributes. It reaffirms that authentic heritage, if lost, is essentially irreplaceable and that the potential for reconstruction should integrate surviving fabric. In setting out a framework it offers a direction rather than solutions.

In considering the broad context within which post trauma heritage protection must function, it is apparent that additional institutional arrangements are desirable. Intervention will be most effective where cultural heritage considerations are integrated into response provisions at international, national and local levels. It needs to be given an appropriately high profile by States Parties.

4 Structure

The Guidance text is in three parts: The first is titled POST TRAUMA RECOVERY AND RECONSTRUCTION PROCESS: A Framework for Action. It outlines a process through which recovery and reconstruction may be considered and concludes with a short section summarising an overall Framework. The second and third are Annexes: Annexe 1 contains a selection of key reference documents; Annexe 2 is a Glossary covering a range of terms employed in the Guidance document.

POST TRAUMA RECOVERY AND RECONSTRUCTION PROCESS

A Framework for Action

Disasters that affect heritage properties are of many types and causes. Those arising from natural hazards may be sudden, or an evolving consequence of ongoing processes such as climate change, once-off or repeated over time; they may comprise land movement and collapse from earthquakes, storms, flooding, avalanches, landslides and fire. Destruction occasioned by human action may be deliberate or accidental, the result of conflict or unrestrained resource exploitation. Catastrophes may be sudden, short, protracted, intermittent, focussed on cultural artefacts or generic.

Catastrophic events are characterised by human tragedy, loss of life, home and community, population displacement and loss of roots and traditional culture. At the same time, the impacts of events triggered through natural causes can differ from those arising from human action: for example, in the case of natural disasters, community and social relationships often display a great solidarity, and may prove to be resilient, while in the case of conflict differences may be long-standing, or deeply implicated through causality or consequence, and divisions may persist over time. Often as a result of the catastrophe, intangible heritage is also lost, as a consequence of death, migrations, or such interventions as area reconstruction.

This framework for action is set out under three principal headings: Factors of Inheritance and Transmission, Organisational Factors, and Preparedness. A final section presents the Framework in summary form.

1 FACTORS OF INHERITANCE AND TRANSMISSION

The diverse and complex nature of disasters poses challenges to definitions of phases of recovery and of opportunities within intervention strategies, as describing actions under time-sequence headings such as before, during and post-event can be simplistic. For example, preparedness and mitigation actions can be possible or necessary while events continue, and may require *ad hoc* response that might not have been envisaged. However, it is useful to outline some broad categories of action; their implementation will depend on individual circumstances, and they may overlap or be repeated as events unfold.

It is recognised that responses depend on the national visions and strategies as well as the capacities of States Parties, their institutions and agencies and those of the local population, and as supported by many types of international organisations. The factors involved are outlined in Section 2: Organisational Factors.

From the perspective of cultural heritage, the guiding principle can be set out: the primary factors in the recovery process are the identification of impacts on the inheritance, expressed through the attributes of OUV, both tangible and intangible, the implementation of measures to protect and stabilise surviving attributes, and the development of recovery and reconstruction programmes directed towards the preservation and transmission of attributes to the future.

1.1 The Identification of Attributes of OUV.

A Statement of Outstanding Universal Value lies at the core of any inscription and management plan for World Heritage Sites. An integral element is the identification of attributes that convey OUV. It is crucial that the identification of attributes be as complete as possible so that damage or loss can be systematically recorded, appropriate mitigation measures be implemented, impact on the significance of the site be assessed, and options for recovery and supporting actions can be identified.⁴

In addition to material elements or landscape, attributes that convey OUV may include intangible factors, such as socioeconomic structures, the rituals, narratives, skills and livelihood activities of resident populations, and inhabitants' relationships with history and the past. OUV may be integral to the ongoing place-making activities of individuals and communities. The question of reconstruction therefore relates to both tangible and intangible dimensions of heritage.

It should also be noted that destruction can be an opportunity for the discovery of new attributes (for example, archaeological ones as in the city centre of Beirut) or for the restoration of scars resulting from earlier, badly informed actions. Therefore, one needs to underline that the relationship between OUV and reconstruction is a dynamic one, and the existing Statement of

⁴ As it has been noted before, many of the former Dossiers, though some are on process, have not been complemented yet, either by a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, or by the identification of the more representative attributes.

OUV may not be the sole entry point to reconstruction choices. The interpretation or revision of OUV may be a key to generate a recovery or reconstruction vision for a property.

Shortcomings in the identification/definition of attributes may become evident when the process outlined below is considered. One purpose of this Guidance is to enable States Parties and other stakeholders, as soon as they are able to do so, to evaluate the quality of the descriptions of attributes from the perspective of their possible depletion or destruction. This matter will be considered further in Section 3: Preparedness.

It is expected that assessment of the impact of destructive events on the attributes of OUV will occur within a wide range of circumstances, political contexts and will span over varying timeframes. In this document, Guidance on actions towards recovery is organised under four headings: First/early response, Review of Impacts, Identifying Options for Recovery and Reconstruction and Framework for Action.

1.2 First/Early Response

The initial assessments of impact must be made in the immediate aftermath of traumatic events. It is recognised that these assessments may be provisional, and made while the primary focus of States Parties and other agencies is directed towards infrastructural, security and humanitarian response. The following elements are indicated: initial identification and documentation and immediate protection of surviving attributes, elements, artefacts or other heritage assets (Annexe 2).

a Initial identification and documentation of impacts.

While the existence of documentation prior to disaster is fundamental for comparison (see Preparedness 3), the importance of early recording of damage and surviving elements is emphasised. The priority for documentation is established on the basis of historic records and the attributes of OUV, or on the more obvious and iconic attributes, internationally or locally referred to, and how they are manifested. Image capture (such as photographs, aerial views, etc) is a first essential step; other forms of documentation such as audio recording must be utilised as circumstances allow. Comparatively simple technologies/techniques such as recording by mobile phones or tablets, crowd sourcing of images, and the use of drones and robots for 3D documentation have established their value in disaster settings, as has the use of sonic and thermographic characterisations of damage, internal dispositions and historic layerings.

Measures must be in place to capture and retain such data as evidence and for use in the assessment of impact on attributes and the identification of further actions towards recovery or reconstruction. It is also important to assess the underlying factors that may have increased the property's vulnerability in order to allow the reconstruction framework to address them as the recovery process unfolds.

Data needs to be managed and transmitted in usable forms. Coordination at international and national levels is required for this purpose as multiple entities are generally involved. It is imperative that the States Parties and responsible agencies can access the necessary data (Sections 2 and 3). It may be noted that such data is important, not only for the recovery actions and loss assessment in that specific disaster, but also provides a resource for response to other similar disasters.

b Protection

While initial responses are ongoing, every means must be employed to safeguard, stabilise and secure impacted heritage structures in order to avoid further damage, depletion and loss. In-situ protection should be encouraged when possible, but controlled dismantling may sometimes be necessary either to protect life or to enable later repairs and reconstruction of existing fabric, however this should only be considered when devices such as temporary shoring are insufficient.

Protection extends to fragments, contents and artefacts; these must be identified, protected, collected, numbered, and if displaced, securely stored for later reinstatement and to prevent looting. Modern technologies and techniques may have an essential role in temporary shoring, protection and storage. However, such interventions may require engineering expertise in cases where structures have become destabilised.

Resident populations may be extremely vulnerable, and loss through injury, death and displacement will impact on the community's socio-economic and physical capacity for recovery. It may also have an impact on the options for the recovery of attributes. Initial and ongoing responses must include, in coordination with humanitarian agencies/NGOs, practical and ongoing supports that can sustain the population within their own habitat as far as possible. It should be noted that assessment of impacts of this nature will necessarily involve the active engagement of communities in all stages of the process.

Until such time as an initial assessment of impact can be made, reconstruction beyond emergency measures should be avoided. Such temporary measures as are necessary should not eliminate or inhibit options for future repair or reconstruction that could recover attributes of OUV.

1.3 Review of Impacts

Establishing the impacts of an event on heritage assets involves determining their post-event status and any potential effects which could have impacted their significance. Initial assessments of traumatic impacts on the attributes of OUV must be made on the basis of information gathered through resources that are at hand, if possible through a combination of off-site and on-site multidisciplinary methods. New technologies offer opportunities in this respect. This will provide a provisional understanding of the scope of damage and of immediate actions required to mitigate effects and prevent further loss.

The process of establishing the status of attributes and assessment of impacts takes time. Although the process may commence even as events unfold, reaching conclusions is likely to require more specific information, additional documentation, and further, in-depth analysis. Whenever feasible, assessments of impact must include documentation of the effects of events on social and economic conditions, services, infrastructure and environmental factors, as well as cultural assets. Processes will vary between uninhabited archaeological sites and those supporting living communities. In the case of continued and protracted disasters, it is recommended that a timeline be drawn up that records successive phases of the destructive events.

Early interventions must not predetermine future choices or outcomes. The desired outcome following the initial assessment of impacts is an accurate appraisal of the status of the attributes, followed by the identification of options for recovery and reconstruction that are optimal for the retention or recovery of OUV (par. 1.4).

The creation of an inventory of the heritage elements that comprise the attributes of OUV and their post-event status will serve as the primary tool. The inventory should describe whether or not each heritage element has survived intact or suffered damage, and in what ways it has been depleted. This raw data will constitute the basis for assessing the impact of damage on attributes that convey the OUV of the property and for exploring options for recovery. Assessment at this stage may indicate whether damaged tangible or intangible attributes are recoverable in the short term or over a longer period, or whether they have perhaps been lost or depleted beyond recovery.

How this requirement is met is related to context: the priority is to ensure that the primary structure for information-gathering and assessment is appropriate, so that the information can be supplemented as circumstances allow and provisional assessments revised accordingly.

States Parties may secure the assistance of ICOMOS and/or other international heritage agencies in executing this task.

Actions towards recovery will be more sustainable if pre-existing defects that have contributed to failures when the high impact disaster occurred are identified as such in the course of investigation – not all damage can be directly attributed to the impact of a particular event. Examples include the decay of building fabric (insect attack, rot, etc), changes in ground conditions or defects in maintenance.

1.4 Identifying and Assessing Options for Recovery and Reconstruction

The establishment of the post trauma status of all the tangible and intangible attributes of OUV forms the basis for identifying and assessing the options for recovery and reconstruction. Optimal documentation and evaluation of surviving attributes, and an adequate overall assessment of impacts is key to robust identification of options and the basis for any programme of recovery-directed actions. The question of whether and how reconstruction may allow the recovery of attributes arises in this context. Moreover, the question of revising the OUV and integrating newly identified attributes might bring valuable contributions to the recovery plan.

The following paragraphs set out, for illustrative purposes only, some examples of circumstances in which reconstruction options for material fabric might be explored:

If OUV relates to form, design and function, damaged or depleted attributes may have the capacity to be re-established in some circumstances. In exploring options, the goal will include the maximum retention of historical material and its stratigraphy. This perspective is essential because new structures may not necessarily reflect the historical associations or historical layering that existed prior to destructive events.

If OUV relates to the coherence of an ensemble, and where limited elements have been affected, it may be appropriate to re-establish the integrity of the ensemble, including the use of new compatible materials to do so.

If OUV relates to the dynamism of a city that reflects centuries of urban societies and their formal and informal structures, then the attributes of that urban form might be re-established to re-house the inhabitants and revitalize the social and economic fabric, maintaining the authenticity of the place. While the reconstruction and recovery process can also bring the opportunity for improving the quality of social life, the impact of long-term displacement of populations, or slow pace of reconstruction, is a major consideration, which might affect the intangible aspects irreversibly.

If OUV relates to customary practices such as rituals, beliefs, stories or festivals, reconstruction of tangible attributes (structures and carvings) may be critical to the persistence of those practices.

The conditions outlined above relate to inhabited sites. In the case of uninhabited archaeological sites, any consideration of intervention must prioritise the authenticity of surviving and persisting attributes. Restoration to the pre-trauma state may not be feasible in many cases. At the same time, altered and additional attributes supportive of OUV may become apparent and generate options for the maintenance and enhancement of OUV.

The inventory of the condition of attributes must be followed by a Statement that presents the damage suffered and appraises it in terms of the potential for recovery of the attributes of OUV and of new opportunities. This will lead to the identification and evaluation of possible options for recovery.

The Evaluation of Options for Recovery will be based on the appraisal of the effects of damage. It will identify the purposes, motivation, justification and expected outcomes for each potential recovery option. For each option, it will describe the intervention envisaged, identifying the reconstruction actions proposed, identifying the documentation and resources available, the methodology to be used, the techniques chosen, the steps to be followed and the possible time frame. It will incorporate an appraisal of each option that sets out which attributes will be recovered and the effects on any surviving attributes. The Evaluation of Options for Recovery will conclude with identification of a preferred option based on an evaluation of these factors. The Statement of Impacts, Evaluation of Options and the concluding preferred option will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review.

It is integral to this process that the priorities for recovery clearly respect tangible and intangible attributes, and that these priorities are explicitly established in relation to the expectations of stakeholders with regard to the purpose and time frames of reconstruction. The sustainability of interventions and the re-establishment of local capacities and community cohesion need to be explicitly addressed. The benefits to be derived through the recovery process need to be assessed.

1.5 Developing a Master Plan for the maintenance and recovery of OUV

Once the recovery option has been agreed on in principle, it can become the basis for a specific programme of actions directed towards maintenance and recovery. This programme will be expressed through a Master Plan, incorporating detailed project plans (Action Plans) together with implementation measures, risk assessment and timescales, and will be created through a process involving relevant stakeholders in consultation with Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre.

Action Plan implementation measures should be reported at agreed stages in the process.

2 ORGANISATIONAL FACTORS

Any programme for developing the potential for stabilisation and recovery of attributes of OUV should not be considered in isolation from the wider post-trauma social, economic and environmental recovery. It is essential that the recovery of cultural heritage attributes be made an integral part of the recovery process as a whole, since in many properties the attributes of OUV are indissolubly linked to social and cultural associations and practices.

Recovery of cultural heritage attributes should wherever possible support and drive sustainable development and community well-being.

This link between the recovery of attributes of OUV and the wider recovery process should, where possible, be effected during ongoing events or conflict situations, in emergency response, as well as in post trauma interventions. However, it is recognised that giving consideration to all these aspects may result in tensions among conflicting priorities.

In general terms, effective integration between the recovery of attributes of OUV and the wider recovery process will be characterised by key operational factors including: identification of stakeholders, clarity of operational responsibilities with clear mechanisms for communication and collaboration, appropriate deployment of expertise and skills, and the optimal use of resources.

The interplay of these factors will vary from case to case and as circumstances dictate. It should be noted that there are implications also in terms of risk management and preparedness. These are outlined below in Section 3: Preparedness.

2.1 Identification of Stakeholders

It is essential that the full range of relevant stakeholders be identified and the place of each in the response and post trauma recovery process for a World Heritage property be established. Effective response depends on inclusivity. In the event of disaster, working relationships and communication networks need to function effectively where normal communications may be compromised. At a minimum, the actors would need to include the responsible sections within States Parties' governmental structures, the emergency services and other agencies, cultural institutions, local communities and key stakeholders such as traditional authorities, property owners, key experts and knowledge holders.

The displaced, including the diaspora of the heritage practitioners, should be given special consideration. During a protracted crisis, the relationship between a cultural heritage place and its community is often disrupted, sometimes for years. The possible reconstruction depends on maintaining some sort of relationship alive in the minds of the displaced, including the younger generations. This should be part of an overall strategy for cultural recovery.

This factor applies at local and national levels and will include essential international liaison.

2.2 Clarity of operational responsibilities

It is recognised that among stakeholders, the understanding of impacts and the expectations for recovery will vary widely. Mechanisms must be in place to ensure that perspectives and values are understood, and their relevance to the maintenance or restoration of attributes articulated and given appropriate expression in the recovery process. Roles must be defined and understood. This requires the establishment of clear lines of responsibility and processes for communication and collaboration. It is essential that decisions are transparent and prioritise inclusiveness.

Protocols for the collection and sharing of data must be established. The guiding principle here is that all data on the attributes of WH properties must be accessible by States Parties and thus by all those involved in the conservation and restoration process.

2.3 The deployment of expertise and skills

Effective response is essentially inter-disciplinary. This puts a high priority on clarity of relationships but also on the availability of adequate expert knowledge and skill, from specialist individuals, institutions and the local community. The inclusion of local knowledge, skills, and capacities is critical, and the engagement of local stakeholders in goal setting and programme development is crucial. Effective response requires active knowledge-sharing, organisational flexibility and the ability to respond to changing situations.

The experience and expertise of outside institutions, agencies and specialists makes an essential contribution to informed decision-making. Together with the contribution of the international heritage community and its institutions it comprises a potent resource.

2.4 Effective use of resources

Resources comprise financial allocations, availability of expertise and equipment, and community knowledge and skills. Adequate provision must be made within the resources assigned to disaster response to address heritage impacts, and specifically those that affect World Heritage properties. Such provision should address the range of situations encountered, as described above.

In the first instance, provision for emergency interventions to protect the attributes of World Heritage properties must be made within emergency funding allocations, and clear arrangements must be in place so that they can be brought into play when response mechanisms are triggered. This provision would address documentation, stabilisation, rescue, salvage, storage, implementation of preventive measures and safe-keeping.

As official responses gain momentum and recovery and reconstruction get under way, it is important to ensure that local capacities and commitment continue to be deployed and are not sidelined, since they are fundamental to recovering and sustaining OUV. Disasters are also sources of opportunity, and the capacities of private interests are a potential resource to be utilised. However, harnessing the capacities of large companies in the interests of rapid reconstruction carries the risk of substituting imported labour and modern technologies for indigenous resources and traditional methods, possibly further depleting the attributes of OUV or the potential for their recovery. Therefore, guidelines for large companies on how to intervene in the respect of local context and OUV should be developed and made available.

3 PREPAREDNESS

In the light of changing global circumstances it must be accepted that all World Heritage properties entail some additional element of risk, making the documentation of tangible and intangible attributes of such properties even more important. States Parties should review their current documentation from the perspective of its comprehensiveness (anticipating possible damage or loss), and existing provisions for storage and retrieval both in emergency situations and in the longer term. Particular attention should be paid to requirements for updating systems. It is recognised that this is a very major task.

State parties should be also encouraged to use, update, accept, or ratify national and international legal frameworks for the protection of cultural heritage.

3.1 Risk Assessment and Disaster Response Planning

Given the changing nature of the threats to World Heritage, each State Party should ensure that the risks to properties under their care have been adequately identified, and that risk assessments are routinely updated. Risk assessment applies to both tangible and intangible attributes

As required by the World Heritage Committee, all the listed properties should have now a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, based on properly identified attributes, and submitted to the World Heritage Committee.

In addition, a Disaster Response Plan, appropriate for the identified risks to individual properties and detailing strategies for managing or mitigating risks, should be prepared by States Parties and submitted to the World Heritage Committee as an amendment to the Management Plan for those properties. Ongoing review and revision of Management Plans must take explicit account of identified risks, including slow onset risks associated with urbanisation – for example, drainage changes, paving, tourist facilities – which may be obstacles to response and potential sources of risk. Where Management Plans are deficient in their descriptions of attributes and their exposure to risk, they should be updated as a matter of urgency.

3.2 Communication Protocols

It is necessary to make provision for coordination and information-sharing between agencies and key individuals within the jurisdiction, both regionally and internationally. Information capture and storage provisions should be reviewed to ensure access where and when necessary. The resources of UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies are available to assist in developing effective national and international communication networks.

3.3 Embedding Cultural Heritage Protection

Provision for protection must be embedded in wider response processes. This applies in planning that is part of sustainable development plans that foresee job creation and environmental sustainability, as well as in enhancing the knowledge and skill of operatives through targeted heritage training programmes.

3.4 Capacity building

The acknowledged importance of heritage to community identity must be expressed in the active engagement of communities in the care, use and maintenance of their inheritance. Initiatives to increase knowledge and engagement among the population, and the conscious deployment of local resources in ongoing administration and custodianship, will increase possibilities of recovering both tangible and intangible attributes in the aftermath of disaster.

4 SUMMARY: FRAMEWORK FOR POST TRAUMA RECOVERY AND RECONSTRUCTION

Taken together, the considerations outlined above comprise the main elements of a Framework within which recovery of attributes supporting the OUV of World Heritage properties, damaged or depleted through catastrophe, may be envisaged. Within this process proposals can be considered by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Committee at appropriate times. The functional requirement is a Master Plan, which is then detailed in an Action Plan for post trauma recovery with provisions addressed to the issues outlined above, appropriate to the circumstances of each property, and approved by the World Heritage Committee.

The Framework for post trauma recovery and reconstruction is made up of the following elements:

- a The definition of attributes supporting OUV at the time of inscription or as subsequently established (before and after destruction), material and immaterial, with such elaborations in definition as may be required.
- b Documentation and recording of the surviving and lost attributes of OUV, both tangible and intangible, establishing their post trauma status and identifying potential new attributes that support OUV.
- c Assessment of the impacts of events on the attributes of OUV, both tangible and intangible. This will incorporate the input of affected stakeholders, local, national and international.

- d Development of a Statement of Impacts and Identification of Options for recovery of attributes will lead to an Evaluation of Options applied to recovery and/or reconstruction actions under each option. This will conclude with the identification of the preferred option.
 - e The preferred option for recovery will be submitted for approval in principle by the World 2 Heritage Committee. Consideration should be given to the need for quick revision processes in between World Heritage sessions.
 - f Development of an Action Plan for the recovery of tangible and intangible attributes. This Plan will define the objectives of recovery and reconstruction. It will include Method Statements specifying the approach to be taken to re-establishing attributes. In the case of material assets and attributes it will indicate techniques and technologies and implementation provisions. In the case of immaterial attributes it will specify what provisions are in place to monitor developments to foster community cohesion and sustainability and to ensure viability of future uses. It will identify implementation measures. The Plan will be prepared in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Center.
 - .
- Amendments to the Management Plan to reflect changes to attributes of OUV as appropriate.

ANNEXE 1

Selected reference documents

The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments, 1931

UNESCO: Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the event of Armed Conflict, adopted at the Hague (Netherlands) and First Protocol, 1954

ICOMOS: The Venice Charter: International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, 1964

UNESCO: Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972

UNESCO: Recommendations Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas (Warsaw/Nairobi, 1976)

ICOMOS: Washington Charter for the Protection of Historic Towns and Urban Areas, 1987

UN Rio Declaration, 1992

ICOMOS: Nara Document on Authenticity, 1994

UN General Declaration on Cities and other Human Settlements, 1995

ICOMOS: The Declaration of San Antonio, 1996

UNESCO: The Hague Convention, Second Protocol, 1999

UNESCO: Convention on the Protection of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2003

UNESCO: Memorandum on "World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture - Managing the Historic Urban Landscape". Vienna, 2005

ICOMOS: The Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas, 2011

The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter), 2013

UNESCO: Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, 2015

UNESCO: World Heritage Committee. Istanbul Declaration on the Protection of World Heritage, 2016

ANNEXE 2

Glossary of terms

Reconstruction in relation to Outstanding Universal Value (OUV): Reconstruction is a term applied to both material objects and to social structures. With regard to the former, while not being exhaustive, the following list indicates frequently encountered types of reconstruction. These categories are not mutually exclusive.

Reconstruction as before: The word 'reconstruction' within the heritage discourse often implies 'identical' reconstruction (or *reconstruction à l'identique*), that is, the re-building to a state as near as possible to the original. This is rarely achieved in practice, as the relationship with the original craftspeople has been lost, the authenticity of the original materials and their historic value cannot be re-gained, and evidence is incomplete.

Modified Reconstruction: Sometimes form may be the main consideration for reconstruction, and its reinstatement undertaken to complete an ensemble that is a key attribute of OUV. In other cases, the authenticity of material and craftsmanship or revived processes may be at least as important. Structures and forms may need to be modified to reflect new needs and/or to eliminate previous interventions carried out with inadequate levels of technical or design quality and now considered undesirable.

Partial reconstruction: Destruction is often partial, therefore reconstruction needs to engage in dialogue with surviving fabric, posing technical and methodological challenges. It also calls for defining priorities with regard to retention and emergency preservation of what has survived and the appropriateness of utilising fragmentary surviving materials.

Reconstruction as a recurring process: In some properties, systematic phases of rebuilding occur, where collective memory and communities of craftspeople have allowed monuments to be renewed. The specific conditions for this approach need to be clearly articulated, in particular the sustainability of craft communities. Similarly, where building materials are perishable, replacement of individual components or even whole buildings can occur, regardless of sudden destruction. Such renewal may be part of the OUV of the properties but relies on sustaining traditional crafts and techniques. This may also apply to some degree to wooden or stone monuments where damaged elements undergo periodic replacement.

Reconstruction of newly revealed underlying historic layers: Destruction may reveal earlier known or unknown layers of fabric, and reconstruction is seen as an opportunity to reconsider the earlier configuration of a building or of an urban area while taking into consideration what has been revealed. The relationship of what is proposed in relation to what has been destroyed or damaged, needs to be justified in relation to OUV.

Reconstruction as an opportunity to improve building or urban conditions: Destruction impacting on urban fabric may offer the opportunity to remediate problematic situations, improve living conditions, and/or improve the setting of what has survived. Articulating an approach for rebuilding urban areas needs to recover and sustain OUV.

Reconstruction as a critical element to maintenance of customary knowledge, practices, beliefs, or as an opportunity to sustain these or other intangible attributes: supporting the capacity of affected communities to maintain their cultural space, activities and values in the context of changed circumstances

Heritage elements: These are understood as the inherited endowment of buildings, objects, items, features and aspects of the environment, established customs, rituals and practices that comprise contemporary heritage.

Attributes of Outstanding Universal Value:

Definition as per the manual for preparing nominations: Attributes are aspects of a property which are associated with or express the Outstanding Universal Value. Attributes can be tangible or intangible. The Operational Guidelines indicate a range of types of attribute which might convey Outstanding Universal Value, including: • form and design; • materials and substance; • use and function; • traditions, techniques and management systems; • location and setting; • language, and other forms of intangible heritage; and • spirit and feeling; beliefs, stories, festivals, rituals (Paragraph 82). This list is for guidance. It is essential that the attributes identified for a property should flow from the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the justification for the criteria. Attributes must be identified as they are vital to understanding authenticity and integrity, and are the focus of protection, conservation and management.