Extract

Report on Atelier
Komárom

Theme 1: Governance models

European Union
European Regional Development Fund

AT F RT
ATELIER EUROPEAN FORTRESSES

INTERREG IVC
INNOVATION & ENVIRONMENT
REGIONS OF EUROPE SHARING SOLUTIONS

Different definitions/meanings of governance
- *Governance is the act of governing.*
- *It relates to decisions that define expectations, grant power, or verify performance.*
- *It consists of either a separate process or part of decision-making or leadership processes.*
- *It relates to consistent management, cohesive policies, guidance, processes and decision-rights for a given area of responsibility.*
- *"Governance" is what a "governing body" does.*
- *Governance is the way rules are set and implemented.*
- *It refers to the "processes of interactions and decision-making among the actors involved in a collective problem, that lead to the creation, reinforcement or reproduction of social norms and institutions.*
- *"Our joint and uneven terms of engagement with the complex fields of economic, human, social and cultural power relations in which we are all 'stakeholders."*
- *It is a dynamic process involving "structures, functions (responsibilities), processes (practices) and organizational traditions that the board of an organization [or society] uses to accomplish the organizing mission"*
- *'A governance model describes the roles that project participants can take on and the process for decision making within the project. In addition, it describes the ground rules for participation in the project and the processes for communicating and sharing within the project team and community.'*

At the GPEW in October, 2012.: definition of basic lines to analyse the governance models:
☞ governance model on national, regional, local, site scale: conditions and peculiarities
☞ short, medium, long term planning of redevelopment: strict planning vs adjustable starting points
☞ different types of governance models: state owned, privately owned, mixed ownership. (dis)advantages.
☞ preservation of the site versus exploitation possibilities (ppp).

The presented sites/partners:

Governance model on a regional scale	Karen Gysen	Province of Antwerp
Governance model on national/regional level	Peter Ros	New Dutch Waterline/DLG
Vauban Network - Governance (model)	Marieke Steenbergen	Vauban Association
Sveaborg-Viapori-Suomenlinna	Heikki Lahdenmäki	The Governing Body of Suomenlinna
The governance arrangements and issues - Kent and Medway	Paul Cuming	Kent County Council
Governance and the case of Forte Marghera	Marco Acri	University of Nova Gorica
The governance model of the 3 fortresses of Komárom	Erika Farkas	Fort Monostor Nonprofit Ltd.
The governance models of forts of Malta	Malcolm Borg	Paola, Malta
Fort 4 Creative space and urban park	Ann Thomas	Town of Mortsel, Belgium

European Union
European Regional Development Fund

AT F RT
ATELIER EUROPEAN FORTRESSES

INTERREG IVC
INNOVATION & ENVIRONMENT
REGIONS OF EUROPE SHARING SOLUTIONS

Karen Gysen Forten Godels/Fortifications of Antwerp,
- regional governance model
- regional planning covers the whole forts around Antwerp,
- a lot of consensus
- Master plan for the Fortification belts with general vision, division in subareas, obtaining of (local) support, involved stakeholders.
- Strategic plan on a regional scale.
- 3 different types of governance models: state owned, privately owned, mixed ownership.
- There are 4 types of preservation of the site versus exploitation possibilities (nature vs re-use, etc).

Peter Ros New Dutch Waterline
- governance model on a national scale.
- The New Dutch Waterline project (consist appr. 1000 elements, 200 projects) is a part of a national and regional policy.
- complex group of stakeholders: 5 departments, 5 provinces, 25 municipalities, 3 waterboards, (property)owners, private parties, civil societies, inhabitants.
- Governance based on the **cooperation** and on the **coordination**.
- More chance on finances on national level
- Agreements on spatial policy (border problems)
- Agreement on sorts of re-use: the "pancakehouse" problem
- Influence on policymaking on (inter)national level

Marieke Steenbergen Vauban Network
- national level governance from France.
- Vauban Network based on cooperation and equality.
- All represented towns – related to the Vauban Fortifications World Heritage has one vote during the decision making,
- very democratic method.
- governance model were defined "French deconcentrated system".

Heikki Lahdenmäki Governing Body of Suomenlinna
- complex as an organisation,
- complex as a cooperation of stakeholders.
- 22 years of practices on the management of a WH site.
- different practices about the resources (staff and financing), and restoration works
- the statement of O.U.V or the management plan were not required to be submitted with the application, they are being prepared retrospectively.

Paul Cuming, Kent County Council
Chatham defences
- problems/challenges related to the complicated ownership (there is no one owner,
- parts of the area are owned by the Fort Amherst Heritage Trust,
- Fort Amherst Heritage Trust (FAHT) is not a professional organisation so have to match actions to their resources
- can struggle to engage with professional management standards
- difficult to produce an overall Masterplan for the Chatham defences

- where will the FAHT be in 20 years time?
- importance of the operation of a (volunteer) governing body in long term, and the possibility/necessity of an overall Masterplan in wider context of a property.
- importance of support by the County Council to help the FAHT to be successful.

Dover Western Heights
- missing governance body
- no overall control of a complex,
- no steering group, or committee.
- should develop improved ways of bringing together the relevant Western Heights stakeholders in a meaningful and effective way
- real action can take place and a proper Conservation Management Plan developed by the Prince of Wales Foundation.

University of Nova Goricia/ Marco Acri

"Cultural Heritage neither collective nor private, but common goods."
Common goods are defined in economics as goods declined by rivalry and non-excludability.
The management of common goods depends on "community" level and self regulation
- collective goods need a public decision, which is the government's responsibility,
- common goods need a mix of private-public decisions, which comes under governance

'Common goods' refer here to collaborative preservation and production and collective rights of use by people, in accordance with their own "culture"
Forte Marghera's management plan.
The identified fields of management the fort is:
- conservation
- knowledge dissemination
- public usability/use
- valorization (cultural &economical within the limits of the respect of the vocation of the public good.

„The valorization of the cultural heritage is the subject of shared competence of the State and the Region."
- Forte Marghera is part of a bigger complex. It can be though a paradigm for future actions, focal location of a wider management.
- The role of Forte Marghera in respect to the entrenched field of Mestre.
- The type of managemet structure (association, foundation, trust,) should be determined, according to the agreement of Veneto Region and City of Venice.

Erika Farkas Fort Monostor Non-profit Ltd./Komárom
- site level governance by a "publicly owned private company",

Advantages
- Efficient money making
- Non-bureaucratic – decision by the director
- Quick reaction
- Operation as a private company
- combined control of the state & „private company style operation"
- Motivation in raising of own incomes

Disadvantages
- Dependence of public supports
- Personal responsibility
- Limited human resources development

European Union
European Regional Development Fund

AT F RT
ATELIER EUROPEAN FORTRESSES

INTERREG IVC
INNOVATION & ENVIRONMENT
REGIONS OF EUROPE SHARING SOLUTIONS

- Bureaucratic supervising processes in a quickly changing economical (private) environment
- Vulnerability of political changing

Dr. Malcolm Borg Paola/Malta

- many kind of governance models,
- high number of their practice in different kind of utilization of fortresses in Malta
- governing by midi consortiums (99 years lease agreement – The Manoel Island and Fort Tigne)
- governing by various consortiums (99y lease agreement - Fort St. Angelo, Fort St. Michael and Docks)
- governing by one consortium/company (65 y lease agreement – Pinto stores and Wharves)
- governing by NGO's (Cultural/Sports lease THE RINELLA PROJECT by Fondazzjoni Wirt Artna, by and THE Coastal by Din L-Art Helwa)
- Private enterprises (the Sliema fort and battery)
- STATE + SCH + NGO, (The Corradino Lines by Paola Heritage Foundation)

Ann Thomas Fort 4 (Mortsel)

- The Fort 4 as a creative space and an urban park
- under development by the municipality of Mortsel since 2000.
- public-private partnership for management.
- fort is owned by the municipality of Mortsel, were renovated, restored by the municipality, and now, there is a starting phase of private businesses and events within the fort.

SUMMARY OF THE WORKSHOP 1 – THEME: GOVERNANCE MODELS

The introduced sites should facing similar challenges, but many of them found different answers to that. The presented models were:
- governance model on national level
- governance model on regional level
- governance model on local level
- governance model on site level

Summary of the SWOT– annex 1

Conclusion: There **is no one ideal model**, the decision makers should choose the best for their sites related to their enabling conditions and possibilities.

The basic for the right choose - generally
- Identification of the site – holistic approach, know the most about the place (intangible and tangible cultural heritage) past & present.
- clear ownership, decision-making process
- defined responsibility (organisational, personal)
- exact vision of future for the site
- defined goals of the utilisation
- utilisation plan and cost-benefits analysis/or feasibility studies (not just economical point of view, but focusing on the sustainability)

European Union
European Regional Development Fund

AT F RT
ATELIER EUROPEAN FORTRESSES

INTERREG IVC
INNOVATION & ENVIRONMENT
REGIONS OF EUROPE SHARING SOLUTIONS

Annex 1. SWOT analysis

	Governance model	Strength	Weakness	Opportunity	Threats
NATIONAL LEVEL	Responsibility/Ownership	Easy decision making Strong decision on development Decision process is simple	Private companies not eager to invest in state owned forts	Lease contracts – with conditions	Policy can changing every election "cultural is less important" long term planning too much number of resources
	Protection of the site	Simple procedures easy to be comprehensive	Too much laws,	Influence on changing laws depends on the state	Restoration philosophy influenced by political colour
	Financing	Easy access (even for EU funding) and decision priorities	No private investments	Easy access and influence future funding programmes	No interest for culture Changing EU funding priorities
	Quality management	Expertise on high level Long term plans	No consideration for management incompatible instructions	Expertise can be rather an advantage	Policy might change

Governance model		Strength	Weakness	Opportunity	Threats
REGIONAL LEVEL	Responsibility/Ownership	Facilitation, overall vision, different kind of governance models could act intermediate the local	Diversity of interests, vulnerable to change	win-win support, cooperation goodwill by network Voluntary organisations	different ambitions, political boundaries lack of communication, lack of responsibilities
	Protection of the site	Focus on key issues provide examples Can be selective	Lack of balance in management	Planning a management at regional level	Too much protection on one aspects (e.g.bats)
	Financing	EU regional funds can be share	Often lack of resources	EU funds, Europe as a region	Misuse of resources
	Quality management	Authority of knowledge Realistic ambitions	lack of knowledge lack of sharing information	cultural diversity capacity building	political decision makers over rule Frustration

Governance model		Strength	Weakness	Opportunity	Threats
LOCAL LEVEL	Responsibility/Ownership	Enabling local involvement/gender committee higher possibility of success local cohesion enforcement capacity to better describe of the local importance of the site	less aware of national strategies no networks much, than before	Higher flexibility of sense Could become accountable	Could be affected by wider policies Damage future value Strong priorities wrong allocations
	Protection of the site	Better cultural constants implementation of local regulations accountability	Less financial results Not open for new ideas (extremities)	More informative, more creative planning for listing	too creative
	Financing	Local people are sure of the funding of the money	Limited financial support from national government	Higher opportunities for alternative financing Volunteers	Vulnerable to damages on regional trends
	Quality management	better communication higher efficiency of QM	Loosing the national support coherence of the authority	Flexibility in the implementation of management structures	conception on narrow view

Governance model	Strength	Weakness	Opportunity	Threats
SITE LEVEL Responsibility/Ownership	Integrated ownership Fast decisions Direct responsibility	small local not enough networking Not flexible municipality fails to finance	One vision for development More government funding 100% military funding Direct interest from the army Lease	Politics interferes with uses Fortification is a threat Fragmented responsibility
Protection of the site	Strong protect long term management plan Listed with the buffer zone World Heritage can be the maximum level	Municipality controls the site	Severe fundig from investment More spread investment/incomes Label tourism (World Heritage)	Urbanism Peak threats stress on infrastructure Development (mild) threat Industrialisation Lack of holistic approach to management the site
Financing	Local finance is available fixed income guaranteed Long term finance secured	very bureaucratic, not flexible not commercial, fragmentation	protected areas are guaranteed financing military can guarantee funding	The extension of areas may be unmanageable Fragmentation
Quality management	Less interference, High quality conservation	small, local, not enough networking challenged to be an integrated system	fixed roof of professionals, professional competences NGO's managing the sites	Political change (negatively effects)