



The 7 Most Endangered List

Guy Clausee, Director/Special Advisor, EIB/EIBI

Designing Investment Funds for UNESCO Sites

STAREBEI Research Workshop
Organised by the EIB-I and Sorbonne University,
Paris, 31st March 2014

Overview:

1. The „7 Most Endangered“:

- ❖ Concept of the Partnership
- ❖ Implementation
- ❖ First horizontal conclusions

2. A specific example: Vauban Fortifications in Briançon

The “7 Most Endangered”

A new and innovative partnership between Europa Nostra and the EIB Institute, covering all Europe regions

- Special focus on “endangered” sites & monuments
- Combination of complementary skill sets of NGO and IFIs:
 - Cultural expertise and lobbying work: Europa Nostra
 - Project analysis & implementation expertise, business planning: EIB-Institute, ECB
- Select 7 priority sites, on-site mission, independent technical check and report: viability, phasing, funding options
- 2013 vintage: “in production”, 2014 vintage: nominations shortlisted

The 2013 “7 Most Endangered”: Preliminary results at project level

Site	Technical issues	Amount invested	To be invested	Funding issues
Roman Amphitheatre Durrës, Albania	Humidity (frescoes); houses on site		7 mio	Very limited EU-funds; CEB loan?
Buffer Zone Nicosia, Cyprus	Evacuated part of town; many buildings & owners Political coop issues	(24.4 mio)	5.5 mio	Scope + implementation dependent on peace process; EEA grants?
Vauban Fortifications, Briançon, France	Many large ex-military buildings in small mountain town	1-2 mio p.a.	70+ mio?	ERDF max 50%; Find urban use for all the buildings Cover O&M cost
Renaissance Monastery, S. Benedetto Po, Italy	2012 earthquake damages; large complex in small town	2 mio	7 mio?	ERDF max 50%; O&M cost Part as town museum
Manuelin Monastery, Setúbal, Portugal	Contract management; Groundwater/flooding risk; Structural stability	3,5 mio	15 mio	ERDF max 50%; part to serve as city museum; Driver for urban renewal?
Armenian Church, Mardin, Turkey	Inclusion of monastery precinct; urban context; partly inhabited		1-3 mio	Availability of EU/IPA in addition to local/national funds
Historic mining landscape, Rosia Montana, Romania	Poor region; threat of large-scale mining impact	t.b.d.	t.b.d.	Mobilise ERDF/ESF for alternative reg. development model

The 2013 projects: Horizontal conclusions (1)

- ❖ Review confirms all projects' cultural heritage priority
- ❖ Selection process sometimes may have accelerated renovation works & related funding
- ❖ But investment cost also tends to increase
- ❖ Owner support to renovation is crucial
- ❖ Complex works, need for prioritization and phasing
- ❖ Some sites appear over dimensioned for depopulated/isolated home towns
- ❖ This raises even more issue of continued post-renovation use and of sustained O&M cost coverage
- ❖ Transfer of project expertise requires an existing project
- ❖ Strong representation of Southern/S-E sites is no must

The 2013 projects: Horizontal conclusions (2)

- Most projects need a mix of funding sources:
 - Public and private
 - Local, regional, national, EU or similar
 - Preferably grants, additionally loans/guarantees
 - Investment plus O&M cost funding
- EU funding decisions are primarily taken at national or regional level
- Hence need for strong positioning at that level & for local expertise on relevant funding sources and modalities
- Funding often dependent on projects' well argued contribution to regional economy, job creation, etc
- EU grants in non-convergence EU regions limited to max 50% support; no coverage of O&M cost!

Beyond 2013...

- ❖ Most 2013 projects need some more advice and support in 2014 and potentially beyond
- ❖ Yet 2014 projects will be added during the year
- ❖ Question 1: Who/How best cope with increasing number of projects? Mobilise seed money?
- ❖ Question 2: Respect local/national ownership of projects, avoid „dependency attitude“
- ❖ *„Think and lobby globally, but act locally“*

Vauban fortifications in Briançon, France



Vauban Fortifications, Briançon: site

- ❖ Five groups of fortifications designed and built by Vauban: Military Engineer and Royal Adviser;
- ❖ All UNESCO World Heritage Sites
- ❖ Condition of sites mostly poor – limited public access due to risks of structural failure;
- ❖ Located on heights (1400 – 1600 m) above Briançon in French Alps – small commune of 12 000, former garrison town;
- ❖ Most sites now transferred to commune: along with other ex-military structures (except Fort des Têtes, 41 ha);

Vauban Fortifications, Briançon: town

- ❖ Briançon – highest, sunniest Commune in France, relatively mild climate, historic health tourism;
- ❖ Mainly summer tourism, but limited accommodation;
- ❖ Economically weak - still recovering from loss of garrison;
- ❖ Some technical resources and strong will to develop the sites, but:
- ❖ Very limited financial resources – already stretched without considering the fortifications;

Vauban Fortifications, Briançon: restoration

- ❖ Largest site: 41 Ha, 10 040 sq.m. usable built area:
- ❖ Smallest: 4 Ha, 660 sq.m.
- ❖ Total: 68 ha
- ❖ Limited electricity and water, no other utilities;
- ❖ Limited access in winter;
- ❖ Cost to stabilise the sites: €40 – 50 million public funding
- ❖ Basic redevelopment: €30 million public/private funding
- ❖ or: Full (re)development: €65+ million, mainly private

Vauban Fortifications, Briançon: issues

- ❖ No current mechanism to monetise the economic benefits of stabilisation and recover costs - maintenance would be €2 million per annum;
- ❖ Doing nothing not a valid option - security;
- ❖ Wide range of alternative uses for the sites: public and private;
- ❖ New uses would need to both attract and house tourists, while offering public services: tourism expansion plus diversification
- ❖ Critical issue 1: the source of funding;
- ❖ Critical issue 2: capturing the economic benefits to achieve sustainability.
- ❖ National historic needs versus local future resources

Vauban Fortifications, Briançon

Recommendations

- ❖ Full market analysis: tourism and real estate demand under various redevelopment scenarios; Call for ideas;
- ❖ Treat the sites as a new Quarter of the Commune – full urban redevelopment plan;
- ❖ Establish a Development Agency, to raise funds and manage the stabilisation, redevelopment and development processes;
- ❖ Only a full (re)development can generate the economic and financial benefits needed for long term sustainability
- ❖ No quick fix: one decade +
- ❖ “problem + potential” has not been created at local level
 - it cannot be solved at local level alone



Thank you

For more information

<http://eib.org>
<http://institute.eib.org>
www.europanostra.org