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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

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