



# EUROPEAN HERITAGE LABEL

2017 Panel Report

5 December 2017



## ABOUT THE EUROPEAN HERITAGE LABEL

The *European Heritage Label* originated out of an intergovernmental initiative created in 2006, under which 68 sites in 19 countries received the label. New criteria and a new selection procedure were introduced in 2011 when the *European Heritage Label* was established at the level of the European Union (*Decision 1194/2011/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 November 2011* published in the Official Journal of the European Union, OJ L 303, 22.11.2011, p. 1- 9).

The new *European Heritage Label* is intended for sites that not only have made a contribution to European history and culture and/or the building of the Union, but also promote and highlight their European dimension to European audiences and demonstrate their operational capacity to carry out these activities. The new requirements are an intrinsic part of the added value of the new *European Heritage Label*.

The procedure for attributing the *European Heritage Label* is carried out in two stages: at the national level a maximum of two candidate sites are pre-selected every two years. Out of these and based upon the recommendations made by the European Panel of independent experts, the European Commission attributes the *European Heritage Label* to a maximum of one site per participating Member State per year.

2013 and 2014, the first two years of the action at the European Union level, were transition years: in 2013 participation was restricted to those Member States which had not taken part in the intergovernmental initiative, whilst 2014 was reserved for candidate sites from the Member States which had been involved in the intergovernmental initiative.

Since 2015, the selection process takes place every other year and participation is open to all Member States provided that they confirmed their interest. 2017 was a selection year.

Sites awarded the *European Heritage Label* are monitored on a regular basis in order to ensure that they continue to meet the criteria for which they were selected. 2016 was the first monitoring year and the European Panel examined the sites awarded in 2013 and 2014. The next monitoring year will take place in 2020 and will include all sites that received the label prior to 2019.

Unless mentioned otherwise, all photographs illustrating this report were included in the applications.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABOUT THE EUROPEAN HERITAGE LABEL	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
THE EUROPEAN HERITAGE LABEL IN 2030 – A VISION	7
SITES RECOMMENDED FOR THE EUROPEAN HERITAGE LABEL	9
Leipzig’s Musical Heritage Sites, LEIPZIG (GERMANY)	9
Dohány Street Synagogue Complex, BUDAPEST (HUNGARY)	10
Fort Cadine, TRENTO (ITALY)	11
Javorca Memorial Church and its cultural landscape, TOLMIN (SLOVENIA)	12
Former Natzweiler concentration camp and its satellite camps (FRANCE & GERMANY)	13
Sighet Memorial, SIGHET (ROMANIA)	15
Bois du Cazier, MARCINELLE (BELGIUM)	16
Village of Schengen, SCHENGEN (LUXEMBOURG)	17
Maastricht Treaty, MAASTRICHT (NETHERLANDS)	18
CONSIDERATIONS BY THE PANEL ON THE 2017 SELECTION YEAR	19
Main findings	19
Working methods and meetings	21
CLARIFICATION OF KEY CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA	22
Extract of Decision 1194/2011/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council	25
TAKING STOCK FOR 2018	26
OTHER CANDIDATE SITES	30
Mértola Historical Centre, MERTOLA (PORTUGAL)	30
Ancient Plovdiv Architectural and Historical Reserve, PLOVDIV (BULGARIA)	31
Archaeological site of Monemvasia, MONEMVASIA (GREECE)	32
Sites of Great Moravia, MIKULČICE – KOPČANY ARCHAEOLOGICAL PARK (CZECH REPUBLIC & SLOVAKIA)	33
Oradea Fortress, ORADEA (ROMANIA)	34
Bussaco Cultural Heritage Site, BUSSACO (PORTUGAL)	35
Historical Centre of Turaida, SIGULDA (LATVIA)	36
Imperial Palace, INNSBRUCK (AUSTRIA)	37

Revitalized fortresses of Šibenik, SIBENIK (CROATIA)	38
Two fortresses – one hero, OLD ZRINSKI TOWN ČAKOVEC (CROATIA) & SZIGETVÁRI ZRINYI VAR (HUNGARY)	39
Coudenberg Palace, BRUSSELS (BELGIUM)	40
Eight Estonian and Latvian Manors, (LATVIA & ESTONIA)	41
Lodz – Multicultural Landscape of an Industrial City, LODZ (POLAND)	42
Zsolnay Cultural Quarter, PECS (HUNGARY)	43
Westerplatte Battlefield, GDANSK (POLAND)	44
The Legacy of the Composer Bohuslav Martinů, POLIČKA (CZECH REPUBLIC)	45
<b>WORD OF THANKS</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>ATTACHMENTS</b>	<b>47</b>
Key figures (2013-2017)	47
Participating Member States	48
Timeline of the labelled sites	49
Labelled sites per selection year	51
Labelled sites per selection year, per Member State	53
Labelled sites per Member State	55
Members of the 2017 European Heritage Label Panel	56

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The *European Heritage Label (EHL)* is a EU action that brings cultural heritage sites with a European dimension to the fore. All types of heritage, from monuments and landscapes, to books and archives, objects and intangible heritage, linked to a place, are eligible provided that they are of European significance in terms of the history and culture of Europe or the European integration.

What distinguishes the *European Heritage Label* from other initiatives is that sites must explain their European dimension, that they need to present a project to bring this European dimension to European audiences, and that they need to have the capacity to carry out this project. New and characteristic to the *European Heritage Label* is also that the *EHL sites* are part of a *EHL network*: through the *EHL network*, they develop cooperation projects and support each other to promote their European significance.

This report contains the Panel recommendations and explanations for the attribution of the *European Heritage Label* in 2017. To help future candidate sites submit successful applications, the section on the *Clarification of key concepts and criteria* for the *European Heritage Label* has been updated. As the first cycle of the European Heritage Label as a European Union initiative comes to an end, the Panel has taken the opportunity to *Take Stock for 2018* and to present its view on *The European Heritage Label in 2030*.

In 2017, the European Commission received applications for 25 candidate sites from 19 Member States. 4 Member States participated for the first time and 4 out of the 25 candidate sites were transnational sites: the applications demonstrate a broader geographical range and a trend towards larger scale applications. In terms of heritage typologies, the candidate sites belonged to more traditional heritage such as castles and fortifications. The Panel recommends that 9 new sites be awarded the *European Heritage Label* bringing to 38 the total number of *European Heritage Label sites*. The 9 new *EHL sites* will reinforce the *EHL network* in a considerable way. Six sites present the European history and culture; three sites are related to European integration. Following a now well established tradition, the recommended sites are presented here in chronological order to convey a sense of history.

Several candidate sites had a link to other EU initiatives, but this does not result in being automatically awarded the *European Heritage Label* because the sites must meet the three specific EHL criteria. In particular not all applicants had fully understood to what extent presenting the European dimension of their site is paramount: if the dimension of a site is not well established or articulated, the projects presenting the European significance of the site to European audiences almost never meet the threshold for the Label. Candidate sites may have the necessary skills to carry out their day-to-day operations, but additional skills are necessary to meet the EHL criteria. The Panel calls for increasing language skills at the sites and for cooperation with academics to ensure that the narratives and activities are grounded on established facts and the latest progress in science. The specific evaluations of the candidate sites should be read in conjunction with the general findings. The Panel regrets that once again, because of the limitation of "*maximum one site per Member State*" (*article 11-2 of Decision 1194/2011/EU*), a site meeting all criteria cannot be awarded the Label. The Panel recommends that sites which met all criteria should reapply in the future. It also encourages sites whose (potential) European dimension has been recognised to reapply with a robust project. The *European Heritage Label* is a recent initiative: it will take some more years for applicants to get a good understanding of the expectations, but the quality of the projects is already improving.

The Panel is grateful to all candidate sites that submitted an application. Whether they are recommended for the *European Heritage Label* or not, their work is important. They contribute to new areas of attention in the field of cultural heritage. The *European Heritage Label* has indeed contributed to current thinking on the European dimension of our heritage, about offering heritage experiences to peoples, sharing cultural heritage, common values and principles in Europe and building identity/ies.

I believe that developing a sense of European identity enriches and strengthens your local, regional, and national identity and heritage, as you become part of a community of 500 million citizens who have such rich histories and interwoven cultures. By becoming European you will share all of this. I think it is wonderful and inspiring that in today's Europe anyone can take delight in our shared cultural heritage.

Tibor Navracsics, Commissioner Education, Culture, Youth and Sport (15 November 2017)

In the framework of *2018 - the European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH)*, it is expected that the *EHL sites* will have a special role to play as these themes will receive even more attention in the future. The *European Heritage Label* was the first EU action with the explicit aim of bringing the European dimension of our cultural heritage to the fore. The Panel has always considered the *EHL sites* as 'gateways' to information about Europe's history, culture and integration, and further questioning. The sites being exemplar in opening up their European dimension to European audiences, the *EYCH* is a great opportunity for them to increase their visibility. For the European institutions, the *EHL sites* are excellent examples to illustrate and explain current challenges to the citizens, in particular through social media, because the sites provide contextual information. All *EHL sites* have an enormous potential for education including the sites linked to more recent events and history such as Bois du Cazier, the Pan-European Picnic Memorial Park in Sopron, Historic Gdansk Schipyard, Village of Schengen or the Maastricht Treaty.

The *European Heritage Label* started as an intergovernmental initiative before it was turned into a European Union action. The transition years are now over and the *European Heritage Label* has embarked on its regular calendar of a selection every other year, a four-year monitoring and a six-year evaluation cycle. 2018 will be the year in which the *European Heritage Label* is evaluated. The Panel has gained experience based on four selection years and one monitoring year. It has streamlined its working methods and paid special attention to build up and maintain institutional memory as its composition evolves over the years. With the 2018 evaluation in mind, it has taken stock of the progress and identified some steps that could be considered by all stakeholders.

To achieve their aims, the *EHL sites* need to cooperate in a strong network. One of the ten recommendations put forward by the Panel in the 'Taking stock' section of this report, is that the *EHL Sites* and the *EHL network* receive some financial support to conduct their important work supporting partnership and co-operation between sites, especially since the *European Heritage Label* could provide a valuable contribution to the creation of the *European Space of Education* which the European Commission has called for recently in November 2017.

The Panel had not anticipated that the European Commission would set goals to achieve this by 2025. However, at its last meeting, the Panel held a brainstorming on its vision for the *European Heritage Label by 2030*. This vision and its roadmap are included in this report. By 2030, there should be more than 100 *EHL sites* in the EU and neighbouring countries presenting, dynamically, a truthful perspective on Europe's history and culture.

Ultimately, the success of the *European Heritage Label* depends on the *EHL sites* and their willingness to participate. The Panel hopes that they receive many more visitors during *2018 - EYCH*, including head of states and members of the European Commission. It is significant that several head of states have already visited *EHL sites* and that after President Obama, President Macron choose to talk about democracy and the future of our society and of Europe in Athens in September 2017, with a *EHL site* in the background. The *EHL sites* are driven by their willingness to tell their story, to present their European dimension and to engage with the challenges that Europe is facing. "*Meeting the past and walking to the future*" is their motto, not unsimilar to the slogan of *2018 - EYCH: "When the past meets the future"*.

On behalf of the Panel,  
Bénédicte Selfslagh  
Chairperson

# THE EUROPEAN HERITAGE LABEL IN 2030 – A VISION

The *European Heritage Label* (EHL) Panel, at its final meeting of the 2017 Selection year on 16-17 October 2017, discussed the future of the Label and agreed upon the following vision for the forthcoming years<sup>1</sup>. The starting point is the willingness of the *EHL sites* to "*meet the past and walk to the future*" and their strong commitment to present the European values of human dignity, freedom, equality, solidarity, and the principles of democracy and the rule of law.

## THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE EUROPEAN HERITAGE LABEL BY 2030

1. European Heritage Label sites create convincing new perceptions and narratives reflecting the European significance of our heritage and link the levels of understanding from local, regional and national to a fundamental European perspective.
  2. European Heritage Label sites present a kaleidoscope of cultural heritage integrated in a dynamic network.
  3. European Heritage Label sites offer emotional and intellectual heritage experiences in Europe.
  4. European Heritage Label sites extend across the European Union and its surroundings.
1. The *EHL sites* reveal heritage communities of people, who are proud to interpret their past within the wider framework of European culture and history. They courageously present their site by raising questions. The stories of the *EHL sites* allow the European peoples to develop emotional attachment to cultural heritage in Europe. This then becomes shared heritage and enables the understanding of a multilayered European identity. These communities are outstanding examples of cultural resiliency and solidarity.
  2. The *EHL sites* illustrate the new and fresh definition of and approach to cultural heritage, which is inclusive and value-based. They encompass a great variety of heritage types: archaeological sites, cultural landscapes and natural heritage, historical monuments and places of remembrance, urban quarters, intangible heritage and cultural objects, books and archives, etc. They cooperate as a dynamic network to present European values and principles.
  3. The *EHL sites* are taken care of by communities who are the custodians of their European significance. The *EHL sites* cover, potentially, all Member States, the whole of the European Union including the periphery, and the surrounding territories in which European values are appreciated and cultivated. Through the *EHL sites* every member and neighbouring state can add its contributions to the history and culture of Europe.
  4. The *EHL sites* offer ways to deepen knowledge about the history and culture of Europe and its integration that goes beyond battlefields and trivialities. The diversity of the *EHL sites* embraces not only tangible cultural and natural heritage sites but also social and cultural practices linked to the sites. The *EHL sites* build understanding and solidarity while respecting diversity. These are prerequisites to linking other constituting levels (local, regional, national) of identity to a European identity based on common values and principles.

## THE OBJECTIVES OF THE EUROPEAN HERITAGE LABEL

1. European Heritage Label sites remind us of our shared responsibility for Europe's future.
2. European Heritage Label sites facilitate understanding of our societies.
3. European Heritage Label sites generate a quality shift in the appreciation of European values.
4. European Heritage Label sites construct a dynamic model of heritage governance.

---

<sup>1</sup> The European Commission published its communication *Strengthening European Identity through Education and Culture* on 14 November 2017 (COM(2017) 673 final). In it, it sets the horizon at 2025. In its discussion, the Panel set 2030 as a target date.

1. The *EHL sites* reveal why the Europeans need heritage. The experience gained from the living and radiant heritage of the *EHL sites* transfer a strong message regarding the European perspective in times of uncertainties in which habitual references lose their authority. The *EHL sites* are exemplary in opening up to citizens and raise the awareness of Europeans, including young people, about the benefits of living in Europe as well as of the challenges ahead. The *EHL sites* remind us of the struggle for peace, of improving living and working conditions, food security, education and well-being as a common European endeavour. They rouse us to admire works of art and forms of solidarity and dignity. They present honestly the challenges for cultural heritage preservation, sustainable development and the environment. Their story and storytelling is fact-based, put into context and placed in a geographical and time perspective.
2. The *EHL sites* are the mirrors and ambassadors of European significance and of our shared European history. The *EHL sites* create an excellent opportunity to learn more about and to understand multiple identities in Europe. The *EHL sites* and their projects allow citizens to ask questions that go deeper along thematic fields – struggle for peace, solidarity, quest for knowledge, freedom and democracy, networks of exchange. These reveal why we are Europeans and what unites us in our diversity. They encourage us to make peace with our past and with ourselves.
3. The communities of the *EHL sites* are dynamic, sustainable and resilient. The number of *EHL sites* will have reached 100 sites by 2030. They show a nuanced picture of the evolution of European history and culture and of European integration. They support the emergence of meaningful and inspiring European narratives that enrich and complement the local and national interpretations of our heritage. The increase of the *EHL sites* generates an understanding in the public opinion of European values and principles in the same way as World Heritage has promoted the concept of outstanding universal value.
4. The *EHL sites* link Europeans across states, regions and localities, across borders. Its dynamic model of heritage governance, which replaces the opposition between ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’ approaches, bridges different levels of hierarchies through a consensual decision making process.

#### A ROADMAP TO ACHIEVE THE EUROPEAN HERITAGE LABEL OBJECTIVES

1. European Heritage Label sites and their network receive sufficient funding and official acknowledgment.
  2. European Heritage Label sites and their projects are well-known by a substantial number of European audiences and especially popular among young people.
  3. European Heritage Label sites and their projects strategically integrate new technology into heritage preservation.
  4. European Heritage Label sites are supported by researchers.
1. The *EHL sites* are engaged in a dynamic network which receives continuous funding. Cooperation between *EHL sites* in the *EHL network* and transnational sites are supported. The European institutions use the *EHL sites* to illustrate their policies and challenges: "*we learn from the past to take informed decisions today*". They are used in virtual space (through social media) and presented in tangible space (for example on a wall of *EHL sites* in Brussels and/or Strasbourg). Politicians and decision-makers use the examples and visit the *EHL sites* along with the citizens.
  2. The *EHL sites* act as gateways for the young generations to get acquainted with the history and culture of the continent. School curricula are extended beyond borders. In the same way as the Erasmus networks created a shared European experience of study and education, *EHL sites* and their network of knowledge offer shared heritage experiences to young people using their preferred communication tools.
  3. The *EHL sites* offer the magic of a real place without fear of integrating new technology - Virtual Reality and Artificial Intelligence - into the preservation and representation of cultural heritage. They address the challenges and impacts of the technologies in terms of social relations, culture and health (blurred line between public and private spheres and property; the multiplication of realities and representations, etc.).
  4. The *EHL sites* present their story and their European significance. They are supported by and assessed in cooperation with the European scientific community. They are pilots of innovation in European cultural heritage research. By offering a genuine heritage experience, they provide an alternative to unrealistic expectations, populist and opportunist information, fake news and wishful interpretations of the past.

## SITES RECOMMENDED FOR THE EUROPEAN HERITAGE LABEL

### Leipzig's Musical Heritage Sites

#### LEIPZIG (GERMANY)

#### 13TH CENTURY TO PRESENT

##### Description

Leipzig's Musical Heritage Sites is a series of nine locations in Leipzig (central Germany) representing various episodes in its musical history including churches and educational institutions, ensembles and individual composers, all linked by a trail. The actual sites are the St Thomas Church with St Thomas Boys Choir, St Nicholas Church, Old St Nicholas School, Leipzig Bach Archive in Bose House, Mendelssohn House, Leipzig Conservatory of Music and Theatre "Felix Mendelssohn Bartoldy," Schumann House, Grieg Memorial Centre at CF Peters house, and Leipzig Gewandhaus. The Leipzig Music Trail helps visitors to explore and understand the range of musical activity which has taken place in Leipzig for over 800 years. From the musical tradition have sprung formative composers whose work has shaped European music, world-famous ensembles such as the Thomas Choir, the Leipzig Gewandhaus orchestra, innovative institutions such as the Bach Archives, musical publishing houses, and one of the oldest musical conservatories in Germany.



##### European significance

The significance of Leipzig's Musical Heritage Sites is on two levels: firstly, the historical evolution of European music in Leipzig over eight centuries and the strong associations with outstanding composers. Secondly, the role of the city and its citizenry which has actively participated and supported the development of a widely recognised European

musical identity spanning space and time. Leipzig's musical identity is also strongly associated with European values of freedom and democracy most recently demonstrated during the events of 1989 leading to the collapse of East Germany and the Iron Curtain. The narrative convincingly places Leipzig's Musical Heritage Sites within the context of European history and within recent European history in particular, linking it to European movements and personalities and presenting it as a living vibrant aspect of Europe's heritage. The European significance is clearly articulated in the site's narrative. The candidate site meets the criteria for European significance required for the European Heritage Label.

##### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The project, "European Music Trails - from Leipzig to Europe" expands the European dimension of the existing trail through the alumni of the music conservatory. From the first years of the conservatory students came from all corners of Europe and, on their return home, started enduring musical initiatives. Civil participation is an equally strong element through the active engagement of citizens and artists in exploiting the alumni links through a touring exhibition, concerts, citizen journeys or exchanges. Themes of shared European musical heritage and identity(ies) will be explored, along with civic values. The submitted project meets the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

##### Organisational capacity (work plan)

All nine sites are protected under the Saxon Preservation Order for the Protection of Monuments. Each site is however under separate management. The City of Leipzig will act as co-ordinator between all nine sites to ensure the realisation and promotion of the project. The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to implement the submitted project and to meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

##### Recommendation

Leipzig's Musical Heritage Sites embody the dynamic continuity of a specific European tradition in music and civic engagement. The Panel recommends that Leipzig's Musical Heritage Sites receive the European Heritage Label.

## Dohány Street Synagogue Complex BUDAPEST (HUNGARY)

1854 TO PRESENT

### Description

The Dohány Street Synagogue in Budapest was built between 1854 and 1859 and is today still the largest synagogue in Europe and the second largest one in the world. The site includes the whole complex surrounding the synagogue: the Jewish Museum and archives, the Temple of Heroes and arcades (a Memorial for 10.000 Jewish Hungarian soldiers who lost their lives in WWI) and the garden (which was used as a cemetery for the victims of the Holocaust in 1944/45) as well as the Wallenberg Memorial Park with its memorial tree.



### European significance

The Dohány Street Synagogue Complex functions simultaneously as a synagogue and as a memorial site. The synagogue is a focal point of Hungary's Neolog movement, a branch of Hungarian Jewry which promoted assimilation and integration into European society. The size of the temple reflects the significance and the high cultural standards of the Budapest Jewry. Other parts of the complex such as the Temple of the Heroes and arcades, the cemetery gardens and the weeping willow memorial tree are a memorial site. The complex contains also a well-preserved Jewish archive covering several centuries of Jewish history, Holocaust victim lists, vital documents, census documents that are today available at the family research centre using digital technology.

The European significance is clearly articulated in the site's narrative. The candidate site meets the criteria for European significance required for the European Heritage Label.

### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The candidate site will launch a complex project in order to open those sites which are currently not available to the public such as the Synagogue of Heroes, so that the cemetery garden and arcades can be accessed in their entirety. An open-air exhibition built from mediaeval tombstones is planned too. In 2017, new interactive elements, audio-guides in 9 languages, and information points will be added, while priority will be given to educational and youth programmes as well as cultural events. Staff, multilingual tour-guides and volunteers of the synagogue receive continuous training which are aimed at presenting the European dimension of Jewish culture (architecture, religion, music, literature, the arts and other points of connection). The Dohány Synagogue cooperates with many educational institutions and universities to present the Jewish tradition and culture, and to strengthen cross-cultural communication.

The submitted project meets the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The Dohány Synagogue Complex is located in the protective zone of the Budapest World Heritage Area and is the property of the Budapest Jewish Community. The Community has longstanding experience in managing the site, the Museum and the Archives, often in cooperation with other institutions in Budapest. The important planned annual budget is primarily financed by subsidies and donations. The Budapest Jewish Community also draws upon an important network of European institutions pursuing similar aims.

The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to implement the submitted project and to meet the criteria required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

### Recommendation

The Dohány Street Synagogue Complex, comprising the largest synagogue in Europe, memorials, a museum and archives, is a symbol of integration, remembrance and openness to dialogue. The Panel recommends that the Dohány Street Synagogue Complex receive the European Heritage Label.

## Fort Cadine

### TRENTO (ITALY)

1860-61

#### Description

Fort Cadine is one of 80 fortifications built by the Austro-Hungarian Empire to defend its territory in the region of Trento in northern Italy between 1860 and 1915. The characteristic of Fort Cadine is that the whole body of the fort traverses the road which runs straight through it. It was restored using traditional building techniques and reopened for the public in 2014. Fort Cadine now functions as the information centre for all of Trentino's fortifications of this kind.



#### European significance

Fort Cadine is presented as an important part of the defensive system created by the Austro-Hungarian Empire, uniting military forces from eleven European countries. It illustrates the historically important position of this border region as a place of encounter, division and military confrontation. As a defensive system, Fort Cadine and the large system of fortifications for which it stands, represent Europe's long history of borders and conflicts. Once a former barrier, it is now transformed into a place to understand the fortifications and former borders which existed in this landscape.

As a monument in itself Fort Cadine might seem of modest significance. However, it has been selected to represent the entire system of military defences in the Trento region, historically a significant inner border region of Europe. Fort Cadine is a reminder of contested and changing borders and of national antagonism within Europe. As such, it invites us to reflect upon the effect of the Schengen Agreement. The application convincingly develops the European narrative of the site and the paradigmatic role of the

fortification system during the period of its construction to the end of World War I.

The European significance is clearly articulated in the site's narrative. The candidate site meets the criteria for European significance required for the European Heritage Label.

#### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

Fort Cadine focuses on its function as a place of remembrance of divisions that caused WWI and of raising awareness about former border regions and European integration. The project consists of a number of activities, *inter alia*, a series of ten videos dedicated to the European heritage of fortifications produced by a team of young researchers, a summer camp dedicated to the understanding of the WWI, a competition to create an app for visitors, a strengthened cooperation with other fortification systems around Europe, the creation of a social network profile. Many creative and concrete actions especially involving young people and new technologies are presented. Staff training with regard to the European Heritage Label is planned.

The submitted project meets the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

#### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The site is legally protected and managed by the Foundation of the Museo Storico del Trentino. The Foundation cooperates with the Forestry Services responsible for its environment and has a sustainability strategy. The Foundation acts as the Information centre on the Fortifications of Trento; it documents the other forts and works in close cooperation with the municipalities owning them.

The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to implement the submitted project and to meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

#### Recommendation

Fort Cadine, a representative fortification of the defensive system of about 80 such monuments in the Trento region, is a reminder of historical divisions, military conflicts and changing borders, and provides the necessary context to better understand the value of open borders and free circulation. The Panel recommends that Fort Cadine receive the European Heritage Label.

## Javorca Church and its cultural landscape

TOLMIN (SLOVENIA)

1916

### Description

The Javorca Memorial Church of the Holy Spirit was built by soldiers of the 3rd Austro-Hungarian Mountain Brigade to the memory of the Romanians, Bohemians, Hungarians, Slovaks, Ruthenians, Croats, Slovenians, Austrians, etc. killed at the Isonzo Front during the First World War. The Brigade designed, financed and built this *Gesamtkunstwerk* of Viennese Art Nouveau, the only one of its kind in Slovenia. The Memorial Church was erected in a place visible from all the military positions but safe from enemy shelling. It is now in an exceptional natural environment within Triglav National Park, in the Julian Alps, not far from the Austrian and Italian borders.



### European significance

The Javorca Memorial Church was built by soldiers of different backgrounds to remember the fallen and as a call for reconciliation. Today it is still a place of remembrance and a powerful example of combined efforts by individuals to practice humane relations in times of hardship. The longing for peace of the designers and builders was expressed through their artistic creativity. Thus the church is a reminder of this call for conciliation, equality and human dignity. The significance of Javorca Memorial Church and its cultural landscape outlived three changes of state borders and the eras of fascism and communism. A hundred years later the message is still relevant.

The European significance is clearly articulated in the site's narrative. The candidate site meets the criteria for European significance required for the European Heritage Label.

### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The overall aim of the project is to present Javorca as a place of remembrance and to maintain the collective memory about the solidarity and the intentional and collaborative effort to call upon creativity to honour and to call for religious tolerance. The project will draw upon local knowledge and includes the provision of training for local communities and their herding traditions, as well as local staff. Educational activities, fine-arts creative workshops and exchange programmes will be developed for primary and secondary schools. The number of languages for the website and leaflets will be increased and an independent website will be set up.

The submitted project meets the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The Javorca Memorial Church is designated as a cultural monument of national importance and situated in the Triglav National Park. The municipality, owner of the site, manages the site and is responsible for its maintenance. The Tolmin Museum is responsible for the presentation in situ and in the museum while LTO Sotočje is in charge of tourism promotion and access. A new overall management plan to encompass the church and its cultural landscape is currently being finalised for adoption in 2018.

The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to implement the submitted project and meets the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Recommendation

Javorca Memorial Church is a unique piece of Art Nouveau built in the mountains by soldiers of the WWI Isonzo Front to remember fallen soldiers regardless of their origin and culture; today the church and its cultural landscape continue to function as a symbol of this call for reconciliation. The Panel recommends that the Javorca Memorial Church and its cultural landscape receive the European Heritage Label.

## Former Natzweiler concentration camp and its satellite camps

ALSACE-MOSELLE, HAUT RHIN (FRANCE)  
BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG, HESSEN, RHINELAND-PALATINATE–GERMANY)

1941-1945

### Description

The former Natzweiler Nazi concentration camp and its satellite work camps operated between 1941 and 1945 on both banks of the river Rhine which then belonged to the Third Reich. The network consisted of a main camp with c. 50 satellites, situated in present-day France and Germany. In the Natzweiler-network prisoners from almost all European countries were subject to Nazi terror. Most of the prisoners were originally resistance fighters who were exploited in forced labour.

Over time, many sites related to the Natzweiler network have become places of remembrance. For more than ten years, French and German management teams have worked together on joint projects targeting a mainly transnational public to visit the sites, which are now preserved.



### European significance

The former Natzweiler Nazi concentration camp network is a transnational site of European collective memory. It provides an insight into Nazism and European resistance movements: the network is now a vehicle for preserving the memory of all those Europeans who fought against Nazism or were targeted by it (Jews, Romani, homosexuals, etc.). After the war, many Natzweiler survivors continued to work for citizens' rights. Examples include Trygve Bratteli, Robert Krips, Boris Pahor and Pierre Sudreau.

The memorials were themselves the cause of civic and democratic political movements as often they had to be erected against the will of local authorities who would have preferred to forget the 'concentration camp on our doorstep'.

The European significance is clearly articulated in the site's narrative. The candidate site meets the criteria for European significance required for the European Heritage Label.

### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The primary purpose of the project is to enhance the European dimension of the Natzweiler sites on both banks of the Rhine through transnational cooperation between the French and German custodians of these places. Wider audiences will be reached by developing new visitor centres in the former camps and by creating a cross-border remembrance route between them. A trilingual web portal will be established to provide a database of the deportees, an interactive map of the camps and a bibliography and filmography section about the sites. A joint educational programme is planned including transnational teacher training and a symposium with the European Parliament. Young people are addressed through social media and a photo competition.

The submitted project meets the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The coordinator is the former main camp Natzweiler-Struthof which has become European Centre of Deported Resistance Members (CERD); it is also the site with the strongest human and financial resources. Two sub-sites and former satellite camps are located in France. On the German side, the partner is a federation of twelve associated sites formed as a result of the efforts of local associations with the support of the Baden-Württemberg State Institute for Civic Education. The sub-sites lend themselves to being integrated into a Natzweiler European remembrance and human rights route. They hope to extend the cooperation and the network in the future.

The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to implement the submitted project and to meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Recommendation

The former Natzweiler concentration camp and its satellite work camps detained people from almost all European countries; many were originally resistance fighters opposing the Nazi regime who were

exploited in forced labour; it is both a place of remembrance and citizen's education.

The Panel recommends that the former Natzweiler concentration camp and its satellite work camps receive the European Heritage Label.

## Sighet Memorial

### SIGHET (ROMANIA)

1948-1955

#### Description

The Sighet Memorial is a museum and a memorial housed in a former Stalinist prison in Sighet, north western Romania. Originally built in 1897 as a prison for common criminals, it was used between 1948-1950 to imprison schoolchildren, students and peasants from the Maramureş resistance. Between 1950-1955 many political opponents, journalists and clergymen were imprisoned here, of whom many died. Later it became again a prison for common criminals.

The former prison became in 1997 a memorial to the victims of communist regimes and displays the development and effects of communist regimes in Romania and other countries of Eastern Europe. The museum rooms make use of the former cells and provide insight on replacement of the rule of law and repression by communist regimes throughout the 20th century in Europe, including the resultant death and suffering experienced inside and outside the prison walls.



#### European significance

The Sighet Memorial is a memorial to the victims of communist regimes in Europe. Starting from the viewpoint of the victims, it opened a new perspective on the history of five decades of communism and on the fight for freedom and democracy. By focusing on the fate of many countries in eastern Europe, it stimulates mutual understanding of east and western Europe. The site has managed to transform trauma into resilience, with past suffering becoming part of the shared heritage. With this narrative, the site fulfils an important role in remembering this phase of

European history and making it accessible to visitors and the younger generations who have not experienced it.

The European significance is clearly articulated in the site's narrative. The candidate site meets the criteria for European significance required for the European Heritage Label.

#### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The proposed project of political education is based on a narrative rooted in the physical fabric of the site and the intangible values that can be experienced there. A major objective is to communicate and emphasise the fight for democracy and freedom to young Europeans. The means of doing this include enhanced networking and collaboration with European educational and cultural institutions, better visibility on social media, the organisation of events for international attendees, specifically a summer school, internship and research programs. The availability of English language materials will be increased. The strength of the proposed project is its clear focus on a specific target group, young people, and how it uses the narrative of the site which is also experienced in-situ.

The submitted project meets the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

#### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The site is designated as a site of national interest and it is managed by the Civic Academy Foundation, a non-governmental organisation founded in 1994. The same Foundation is responsible for the International Centre for Research into Communism and an Exhibition Centre in Bucharest. It receives a permanent annual grant from the Romanian state and is constantly developing its international network.

The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to implement the submitted project and to meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

#### Recommendation

The Sighet Memorial is a former prison and a site of remembrance dedicated to the victims of communism and totalitarian regimes, and also to those who tried and still try to combat such regimes. The Panel recommends that the Sighet Memorial receive the European Heritage Label.

## Bois du Cazier

MARCINELLE (BELGIUM)

1956

### Description

The Bois du Cazier coal mining site, its buildings and its grounds form an ensemble which portrays the working classes and immigration to Wallonia (Belgium) in the twentieth century. It focuses on the 1956 mining disaster and the memory of the “gueules noires” (black faces, the name given to miners) from Italy and other countries as rapid immigration to Wallonia (Belgium) had to make up for the shortfall of local labour. In 1956, the entire site, from the pithead to the slag heaps, was the scene of a disaster in which 262 people of 12 different nationalities died. Mining activity stopped in 1967. Since 2002 the site has been open to the public as a site of remembrance with museum exhibitions dedicated to the coal, iron and glass industry.



### European significance

The Bois du Cazier coal mine is an illustration of the Industrial Revolution, working conditions and labour immigration in 20th century Europe. It also tells the history of the European Coal and Steel Community, the precursor of the European Economic Community, which was intended to create a single market for coal and steel. European solidarity was shown following the 1956 disaster through the help received during the rescue operations and the fundraising for the families of the victims. The accident resulted in a revision of safety regulations across Europe and triggered the creation in 1957 of a

permanent body for safety and health in mines by the European Coal and Steel Community.

The candidate site meets the criteria for European significance required for the European Heritage Label.

### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The focus of the project is on the values of solidarity through the lens of industrialisation, migration and the 1956 tragedy. The aim is to show how living conditions have been improved during the 20th century; particular attention will be paid to workplace safety and industrial disasters.

The site provides guided visits on the topics of the *Industrial Revolution, A Migrant's Journey* as well as *In the Miners' Footsteps*, a link with the early stages of the European project. The project consists of signposts, audio guides and guided visits. The staff will be trained in workplace safety and languages. Consideration should be given to involving third level institutions to research further the theme of European solidarity in partnership with this project. The submitted project meets the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The Bois du Cazier is protected under Walloon law and its collections are the core of a recognised museum. It is also a UNESCO World Heritage Site. Owned by the Government Advisory Tourism agency, it is managed by a not-for-profit organisation, which has adequate human and financial resources to manage the site, welcome visitors and to carry out research.

The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to implement the submitted project and meets the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Recommendation

The Bois du Cazier coal mine bears witness to immigration and working conditions in the twentieth century and European solidarity as demonstrated in the aftermath of the 1956 disaster which triggered the creation of a health and safety body by the European Coal and Steel Community. The Panel recommends that Bois du Cazier receive the European Heritage Label.

## Village of Schengen

### SCHENGEN (LUXEMBOURG)

1985/1990

#### Description

Schengen is a village situated at the banks of the Moselle River, in the border triangle of Luxembourg, Germany and France. It is here that the Schengen Agreement and the Schengen Implementation Convention were signed on a river cruise ship in 1985 and 1990. In the village, several places recall the Schengen Agreement: the European Centre of Schengen with its European Museum, several sculptures and monuments, the bridge connecting Luxembourg with France and Germany as well as a pontoon on the river.



#### European significance

The Schengen Agreement was signed in 1985 in the village of Schengen and came into force in 1995. "Schengen" now stands for free movement of goods and passport-free travel for more than 400 million people within the Schengen Area in which 26 European states participate: 22 EU-member states and four European Free Trade Association (EFTA) member states. "Schengen" thus makes European integration tangible. In Schengen, European integration can be experienced in a unique way. The European significance is clearly articulated in the site's narrative. The candidate site meets the criteria for European significance required for the European Heritage Label.

#### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The Schengen project aims to increase awareness of the historical and positive effects of the Schengen treaties. Two specific target audiences have been identified: the generation born after the Schengen Agreement, who have never experienced regular passport controls at internal borders of the European Union, and the staff involved in EU affairs such as customs officials. The target groups will be involved in various actions and educational programmes. The goal is to create a first-hand experience for all visitors, to show what open borders mean, how they contribute to enduring peace, to identify Schengen as a prime example of European integration. The site plans to introduce a "Schengen Day," to nominate "Schengen-Ambassadors" and to create a "Schengen-Label" to mark former customs buildings at the national borders.

The submitted project meets the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

#### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The site was nominated by the non-profit organisation *Schengen asbl*, which has managed the European Centre since its creation in 2005. The organisation works with the municipality and other relevant government ministries and agencies. Following the increase of the number of visitors, they hope to receive additional government funding, in particular to create an "education" department. The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to implement the submitted project and to meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

#### Recommendation

Schengen is a village situated at the banks of the Moselle river, in the border triangle of Luxembourg, France and Germany. It has been synonymous with free movement in Europe since the Schengen Agreement was signed there on a river cruise ship in 1985 and 1990. The Panel recommends that the Village of Schengen receive the European Heritage Label.

## Maastricht Treaty

### MAASTRICHT (NETHERLANDS)

1991-1992

#### Description

Many steps had been taken in the 1980's towards creating an internal market and abolishing any obstacles to this goal. The European Council met in Maastricht whilst working on the desirability of European political and monetary union, and eventually the then 12 Member States - Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Spain, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal and UK - reached agreement on an economic and monetary union there. This was laid down in the so-called 'Maastricht Treaty'. The original of the Treaty is stored in Rome, but a reproduction is kept at the visitor facility in the Province building in Maastricht in the south east of the Netherlands where the treaty was negotiated and then signed on 7th of February 1992.



#### European significance

The Treaty of Maastricht was a milestone for European integration. It created the economic and monetary union - even if a political union that would have provided its political basis was not approved. The Maastricht Treaty led to the introduction of the single currency, the euro. It introduced the principles of subsidiarity and sustainability. It enhanced democratic representation of the European Union by establishing the role of the European Parliament as a co-legislator and created the Committee of the Regions. It further provided competences in the field of culture at European level (then Article 128). The European significance is clearly articulated in the site's narrative. The candidate site meets the criteria for European significance required for the European Heritage Label.

#### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

An international platform for debate and reflection on present-day Europe called "Europe Calling!" has been developed for the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Maastricht Treaty. Together with European institutions and scientific organisations, the intention is to acquire more information on the background, political preparations, negotiations and personal experiences of those involved in the Maastricht Treaty and to reach out through a wide range of activities, including a citizens summit and a youth festival. The strength of the project is the combination of enhanced research, the collection of material and facts as well as the diverse activities to communicate and develop the audience further. The means for this include new media channels, strategic communication tools, storytelling and videos. The high number of languages used in the different media formats is to be increased further.

The submitted project meets the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

#### Organisational capacity (work plan)

In 2016, the display area for the Maastricht Treaty has been given greater prominence in the Provincial buildings to enhance visitor access and improve the interpretation. Different organisations, universities and governing bodies are involved in the proposed activities, but the coordinating function is held by the Province of Limburg. Regular funding and the additional funding for the proposed activities have been secured. The preservation and maintenance of the buildings is secured to modern standards.

The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to implement the submitted project and to meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

#### Recommendation

The Maastricht Treaty (1991-1992) was a milestone for European integration: it was in Maastricht that the then 12 Member States agreed to proceed with the economic and monetary union, which led to the introduction of the Euro, and reinforced democratic representation along with an extension of European competences to new areas such as culture. The Panel recommends that the Maastricht Treaty site receive the European Heritage Label.

# CONSIDERATIONS BY THE PANEL ON THE 2017 SELECTION YEAR

## Main findings

25 candidate sites from 19 Member States were submitted in 2017, including 5 applications from 4 countries that had not sent applications previously. 5 candidate sites were resubmissions, 4 of which had been labelled under the intergovernmental action. Among the applications there were 4 transnational sites, including a former intergovernmental site which was extended to become a transnational application.

This overview demonstrates a broader geographical participation and a trend towards larger scale applications. Many candidate sites belong to so-called traditional types of heritage, such as castles and fortifications, more so than in other years. In terms of European significance, there was a good balance: both strands - 'European history and culture' and 'European integration' - were well represented.

Several candidate sites had a link to other EU initiatives: one site had been restored with funding of the European Structural Funds, other sites had a link to a past or future *European Capital of Culture*. This is of interest, however the Panel recalls that a selection under one EU programme does not automatically result in the awarding of the *European Heritage Label* because the requirements for each programme are different.

The Panel assesses all applications on the basis of their own merit and in a proportionate way, taking into account their character and scale. All conditions laid down in *Decision 1194/2011/EU establishing a European Union action for the European Heritage Label* must be met. All elements must be in the application: the Panel should not read beyond the application and cannot rewrite applications.

A number of trends emerged; these are presented below. The Panel's recommendations on awarding the *European Heritage Label* should be read in conjunction with these general findings.

## EUROPEAN SIGNIFICANCE

The core of all successful applications is the European dimension of the candidate site, presented by means of a clear narrative. Whilst for most applicants, preparing the application triggered reflection on the history of their site within a wider European context, others had not fully understood to what extent presenting the European dimension of their site is paramount. Unfortunately the European dimension and narrative were not well presented by many candidate sites. In some applications the narrative was not even included, whilst in others it was oversimplified. Some were rooted in 19th century national values; others focused on today's European values and in such generic terms that their descriptions could have been used for almost all sites. Several applications claimed that the candidate site was the expression of multiculturalism and tolerance, but failed to demonstrate what set them apart from other similar places in their region. As in previous years, some candidate sites focused on the importance of their site as such, or in a national context, without paying attention to the European context which is one of the key requirements for the *European Heritage Label*. The title of the application did not always reflect the site that carries the European significance. The Panel has made adjustments to the title when necessary.

## PROJECT

The second requirement for the *European Heritage Label* is to submit a project presenting the European dimension of the site to European audiences. As in previous years, the Panel observed that when the European dimension of a site is not well established, the proposed project is not tied into its European dimension: however interesting the proposed activities may be, the proposed project for such sites almost never meets the threshold for the *European Heritage Label*.

The project remained the least effective part of many applications, even for the sites where the European dimension was well established. Demonstrating the European dimension and submitting a project to bring this dimension to European audiences are two new requirements that set the *European Heritage Label* apart from other initiatives. Because they are new, it will take some more years for the applicants to get a good understanding of the expectations. The success rate for *European Heritage Label* applications will increase with the years as a result. The quality of the projects is already improving and two resubmitted candidate sites

whose project previously did not meet the standards, are now recommended for the *European Heritage Label*. The Panel is confident that this trend will continue in the years to come.

A greater number of applications focused on tourism. Cultural tourism is one aspect among many objectives of the *European Heritage Label* mentioned in *Decision 1194/2011/EU*. It should not be the dominant one. Applications for candidate sites where major works are planned, are premature; they should be submitted after completion of the works. The Panel urges all sites to take care of the *genius loci* and authenticity of their site, and to ensure that their activities are sustainable.

## OPERATIONAL CAPACITY

The third criterion for the *European Heritage Label* concerns the operational capacity. Candidate sites have to demonstrate that they are able to carry out the proposed project. The candidate sites may have the operational capacity to carry out their day-to-day operations but this is not the point. They need to demonstrate that they do have the capacity to conduct activities specifically targeted at European audiences. A number of applications were weak in this regard.

The Panel also expresses concern about language skills at the sites. Drafting applications on cultural heritage matters in a foreign language requires special skills which are not equally available in all parts of Europe. For both reasons the Panel reiterates a previous recommendation to make some money available to prepare nominations and to include multilingualism in the projects through cooperation and networking.

The Panel also recommends that the sites seek more cooperation with academics to ensure that their narratives and activities are grounded on established facts and on the latest progress in science. Many successful sites have already established such cooperation, at European level.

## NEW APPLICATION FORM

2017 was the first year the new application form was being used. The form is shorter and it seemed that for the candidate sites it was easier to work with. The legibility for the Panel has improved as well. Because the form follows the order of the sub-criteria in *Decision 1194/2011/EU*, it still contains a few repetitions, such as the reference to young people in both 'the project' and the 'operational capacity/workplan'. The Panel hopes that its interpretation of the difference between the 'project' and the 'operational capacity', explained in *Clarification of the Key Concepts and Criteria* in the next section of this report and in the *European Heritage Label Guidelines for Candidate Sites*, will gradually overcome this difficulty.

## TRANSNATIONAL AND NATIONAL THEMATIC SITES

The Panel particularly welcomed the applications for transnational candidate sites this year, which deserve a special mention for all the efforts they put in their application.

According to *Decision 1194/2011/EU*, transnational sites are to be considered as a whole. The main issue is thus not that all the participating sub-sites are the most representative of their kind, but that overall the candidate site as a whole presents a common narrative and that common activities are included in the project in addition to activities specific to each sub-site. One of the sub-sites needs to act as a coordinator; this coordinator should not only have the operational capacity to implement its own project but needs to have the capacity to be in charge of the coordination of the site and the entire project.

The application form for the thematic sites is not (yet) optimal, but all candidate sites managed to convey their messages. The Panel made recommendations to the Commission to clarify some elements in the application form for the future selection years; they will be brought to the attention of the National Coordinators.

## CONCLUSIONS

The Panel is grateful to all candidate sites which submitted an application. Whether they are recommended for the *European Heritage Label* or not, their work is important. They contribute to new areas of attention in the field of cultural heritage: defining the European dimension of cultural heritage and sharing heritage experiences at European level. The Panel recommends 9 new sites for the *European Heritage Label* in 2017, bringing the total of recommended sites to 38. The Panel regrets that because of the limitation of "*maximum one site per Member State*" (*article 11-2 of Decision 1194/2011/EU*), once again a site meeting all criteria cannot be awarded the Label. The Panel recommends that the sites that met all criteria reapply in the future. It encourages sites whose (potential) European dimension has been recognised to reapply with a robust project.

## Working methods and meetings

As laid down by *Decision 1194/2011/EU*, the Panel consists of 13 members, four of whom have been appointed by the European Parliament, four by the Council, four by the Commission and one by the Committee of the Regions. In 2017, the Panel welcomed four members (re)designated by the European Commission for the period 2017-2019 as well as one new member to complete the 2016-2018 mandate of an expert who had been designated by the Council of Ministers and resigned due to health reasons. An induction meeting to familiarise the new members with the Panel's working methods was organised in Brussels on 19 April 2017.

The European Commission, after consultation with the Chairperson, designated two Rapporteurs for each candidate site and three Rapporteurs for one large transnational site. All Panel members read the 25 applications in order to contribute fully to the assessment of all sites.

The Panel met three times in Brussels:

- 12-14 June 2017, to discuss the merits of each candidate site and to identify those applications for which additional information was needed;
- 11-13 September 2017, to examine the results of the additional information received and to finalise its recommendations to the European Commission;
- 16-17 October 2017, to review the contributions by the Rapporteurs and to discuss the general issues to be included in the report.

The European Commission provided the facilities and support, for which the Panel is very grateful.

At the first meeting of the Panel, the members elected the Chairperson and all members signed a statement of non-conflict of interest with regard to the candidate sites. The Panel follows strict rules: no Panel member takes part in the decision-making process on candidate sites from his/her country and when candidate sites of the country of the Chairperson are being considered, another Panel member chairs that part of the meeting.

At each of its meetings, the Panel checked if observations on candidate sites as per *article 10-5 of Decision 1194/2011/EU* had been received by the European Commission in response to the publication of the list of the 25 pre-selected sites. None were received.

At its June meeting, the Panel started with a general discussion on the overall quality of the applications and the perceived difficulties encountered by the applicants. The Panel recalled the selection criteria and the principles of the *European Heritage Label* spelt out in *Decision 1194/2011/EU* and the benchmarks set during the previous selection years. It then examined each application carefully: each candidate site was introduced by two designated Rapporteurs and was followed by a general discussion. Additional questions for clarification were sent to candidate sites as appropriate. A formal response was received from all those candidate sites.

In September, the Panel considered whether the additional information received answered the questions. Each application was assessed based on its own merits. However, before finalising its final recommendations on awarding the *European Heritage Label* to the European Commission, the Panel considered the overall consistency of its individual recommendations in regard of the list of all *EHL sites*. The Panel reached its conclusions by consensus and only once proceeded by vote because the outcome of the discussion was not obvious. All final recommendations to the European Commission were agreed without reservation.

As in 2015, the Panel came to the conclusion that two sites from one country met the three selection criteria, however, in application of *article 11-2 of Decision 1194/2011/EU* the Panel can only recommend one site per Member State per year. The Panel recommends to the Council and the European Parliament to reconsider this provision when they review the *Decision*.

As the first cycle of the Label comes to an end, the Panel held at its final meeting in October a discussion on the experience gained between 2013-2017 and on its vision for the *European Heritage Label* by 2030. The results these exchange are reflected in the *Vision Statement* at the beginning of this report, and in *Taking stock for 2018*, the next section.

The Rapporteurs finalised their contribution to the final report on each candidate site based on the discussions held during the Panel meetings. After a review of the draft report by the Panel at the last meeting in October, the Chairperson edited the report with the support of the Rapporteur of the Panel. The photographs illustrating this report were included in the applications.

## CLARIFICATION OF THE KEY CONCEPTS AND CRITERIA

Based on the experience gained from reading the applications and in order to help future candidate sites make more robust applications, the Panel is providing the following clarification of the key concepts of the *European Heritage Label*:

### SELECTION CRITERIA

The selection criteria are contained in *Decision 1194/2011/EU* and reproduced on page 25 of this report. They are grouped under three headings: the European significance, the project, and the work plan. The Panel recommends that the applicants read carefully the Decision, the *Clarification of the Key Concepts and Criteria* produced by the Panel and the *European Heritage Label Guidelines for Candidate Sites* prepared by the European Commission before starting the preparation of their application.

### EUROPEAN SIGNIFICANCE

The two strands of European significance – ‘European history & culture’ and ‘European integration’ are of equal importance. Candidate sites must show evidence in the application of their significance under one or both of these strands, by demonstrating one or more of the following (*article 7-1-a of Decision 1194/2011/EU*):

- Their cross-border or pan-European nature: how their past and present influence and the attraction of the site goes beyond the national borders of a Member State;
- Their place and role in European history and European integration, and their links with key European events, personalities or movements;
- Their place and role in the development and promotion of the common values that underpin European integration.

Candidate sites may choose which sub-criterion applies; attempts to demonstrate all 3 sub-criteria when they do not apply may weaken the application.

When assessing whether the candidate sites meet the criterion of European significance, the Panel also checks whether the European significance is fully understood, well-articulated and convincingly conveyed by the sites. This remains a challenge for most candidate sites: cultural heritage sites are used to presenting a national narrative to a mainly national audience. In contrast, the purpose of the *European Heritage Label* is to contextualise and interpret cultural heritage sites of European significance in a European geographical and historical context, thus going beyond national borders and audiences.

Equally challenging is to present the European dimension in clear terms and to take all its aspects into account: oversimplification of the narrative should be avoided. Another pitfall to avoid is presentism or anachronisms, or reading today’s values into sites and events of yesterday.

Significance and interpretation are not static: it will be interesting to see how the sites will continue to deepen the knowledge and understanding of their significance.

### DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ‘PROJECT’ AND ‘WORK PLAN’

To receive the *European Heritage Label*, it is not enough for candidate sites to have a strong European dimension; they need to be taken care of appropriately (good conservation), well managed and present a robust project related to their European significance:

- European significance without a strong project and good management is not enough;
- A strong project and good management without the European significance is not enough either.

Candidate sites should describe their project in precise terms and should demonstrate that they have the organisational capacity to implement it.

### PROJECT

Candidate sites must present a project, which they intend to develop within the framework of the *European Heritage Label* (*article 7-1-b of Decision 1194/2011/EU*). The project should focus on communicating the European significance of the site to European audiences.

This is critical: if the candidate sites do not communicate the European significance at a European level, there is no reason to grant them the *European Heritage Label*.

The submitted project was often the least effective part of the applications, so the Panel recommends that candidate sites prepare and plan their project carefully.

When assessing whether the sites meet this second criterion, the Panel examines the proposed activities as well as how the candidate site intends to make progress during the next four years. Some candidate sites already run numerous activities to communicate their European significance. For these sites, the challenge will be to add a new dimension to their work whenever possible.

The project should include activities that are dependent on the characteristics, the carrying capacity and the needs of the candidate site. Hence the projects are expected to be as diverse as are the sites, e.g. how to highlight and present the significance of archival documents to the public, how to balance access and preservation, how to present intangible values of a site to younger generations, etc. The proposed educational activities should be equally very site-specific and intrinsically linked to the European significance of the site.

The Panel considers that information sessions and/or training for their staff on the *European Heritage Label* in general and on the particular reasons why their site received the Label should be an important element of the project. In addition, providing training for staff members to improve their language skills may need to be considered by some candidate sites.

Candidate sites may wish to start their project by expanding the communication on their European significance to local communities and visitors first, before reaching out to European audiences. This is fine, however the Panel considers that the communication on the European dimension of the site should be robust and expects the candidate sites to develop a strategy to that effect.

A goal of the *European Heritage Label* is to provide access to a range of audiences not only to local citizens and visitors, so the Panel always pays particular attention to the website of each candidate site because this is the easiest way for the majority of the European citizens to access the sites. There are various levels of acceptable web presence, from a nice section on an existing site to an interactive website. But in all cases it is important that the website is easy to find regardless of the national language or country of origin of the on-line visitor, and that the European dimension is well explained in several languages. Finally, should the candidate site be awarded - the *European Heritage Label* status and the *EHL network* must be adequately presented. However, the Panel wishes to stress that presenting the European significance is not synonymous to using the *European Heritage Label* logo in communications: the use of the logo does not imply that the European significance of the site is clearly presented.

To assist the candidate sites in improving their visibility on the web, a quick checklist is included below.

The Panel recommends that all *EHL sites*:

- Put a 60 word statement on their European significance on their front webpage/home page of their website,
- Add the logo of the *European Heritage Label* to their front webpage/home page and link it to the website of the European Commission,
- Put on their front page/home page a link to a subpage with more information on **why** the site received the *European Heritage Label*,
- Ensure that their webpage/website is easy to retrieve, regardless of the language in which the search is made, and
- Update the descriptions of their site in free online encyclopedia.

For the 2017-2020 period, the Panel identified priority actions for the sites that have already been awarded the *European Heritage Label*: reinforcing their presence on the web in more languages, providing staff training about the *European Heritage Label* and the reason why their site received the Label, ensuring that staff members have the necessary language skills, providing the largest possible access for all with a special attention for the needs of the impaired, and developing the European dimension in the educational activities targeted at schools and young people. Candidate sites should make every effort to include activities related to these priorities in their project.

## WORK PLAN = OPERATIONAL CAPACITY

Candidate sites must have the organisational capacity to implement the project submitted with the application (*article 7-1-c of Decision 1194/2011/EU*). There should be a stable, professional and viable structure, ensuring the functionality of the site and capable of managing the proposed project. This should be demonstrated by information provided under the section 'Work Plan' of the application form.

The candidate sites should explain by whom the site is managed, who is responsible for the scientific content, the relations between management and scientific content. In other words: how the management functions. For most sites no substantive changes will be required should they receive the *European Heritage Label*. Some sites however, may need to reinforce their operational capacity in terms of human resources and/or funding in order to carry out the proposed project and these should be indicated in the application form.

The heritage status of the candidate site should be mentioned as well as any preservation/conservation issues affecting the status of the site. These should be handled in accordance with the legislation applicable and reported to the National Coordinators.

Candidate sites often expect the European Commission to make the *European Heritage Label* better known through branding and communication to achieve greater visibility. However, the candidate sites themselves can contribute to this objective by better integration of the *European Heritage Label* in their own communication and they should explain how they intend to do this. Their communication strategy should go beyond using the logo of the *European Heritage Label* and the communication material provided by the European Commission. There are interesting examples of awarded sites that although part of larger institutions, managed to use the designation and drew upon their own strengths to overcome administrative and financial obstacles to implement their project with a lot of creativity.

## KEY INDICATORS

Each *EHL site* shall be monitored on a regular basis to ensure that it continues to meet the *European Heritage Label* criteria, that the project is carried out as outlined in the original application and that the site has still the operational capacity to implement the project. Therefore the Panel recommends that candidate sites think through their project and their operational capacity in detail.

The listing of activities to implement the project should be used as a tool to define the *European Heritage Label* project. It helps to identify appropriate indicators by which the project can be monitored to maintain *European Heritage Label* status for the site. The central question for the sites is, "How would **you** measure the success of your project?"

The candidate sites should be aware that *EHL sites* are expected to keep an eye on the monitoring themselves. Every fourth year, there is a formal monitoring at national and European level. The next monitoring year will be in 2020.

## PRESENTATION OF THE APPLICATIONS

Candidate sites should also be aware that where descriptions and argumentation in the application exceed the required number of words or pages, this may actually disadvantage the applicant as an overload of extraneous information can create confusion for the reader.

To ensure that the application does convey the intended key messages, candidate sites are encouraged to seek proof-reading assistance of the draft application by peers and of translations by native speakers before submitting them.

Extract of Decision 1194/2011/EU  
of the European Parliament and of the Council  
of 16 November 2011

Article 7 Criteria

1. The attribution of the label shall be based on the following criteria ('criteria'):
  - (a) Candidate sites for the label must have a symbolic European value and must have played a significant role in the history and culture of Europe and/or the building of the Union. They must therefore demonstrate one or more of the following:
    - (i) their cross-border or pan-European nature: how their past and present influence and attraction go beyond the national borders of a Member State;
    - (ii) their place and role in European history and European integration, and their links with key European events, personalities or movements;
    - (iii) their place and role in the development and promotion of the common values that underpin European integration.
  - (b) Candidate sites for the label must submit a project, the implementation of which is to begin by the end of the designation year at the latest, which includes all of the following elements:
    - (i) raising awareness of the European significance of the site, in particular through appropriate information activities, signposting and staff training;
    - (ii) organising educational activities, especially for young people, which increase the understanding of the common history of Europe and of its shared yet diverse heritage and which strengthen the sense of belonging to a common space;
    - (iii) promoting multilingualism and facilitating access to the site by using several languages of the Union;
    - (iv) taking part in the activities of networks of sites awarded the label in order to exchange experiences and initiate common projects;
    - (v) raising the profile and attractiveness of the site on a European scale, inter alia, by using the possibilities offered by new technologies and digital and interactive means and by seeking synergies with other European initiatives.

The organisation of artistic and cultural activities which foster the mobility of European culture professionals, artists and collections, stimulate intercultural dialogue and encourage linkage between heritage and contemporary creation and creativity is to be welcomed whenever the specific nature of the site allows this.
  - (c) Candidate sites for the label must submit a work plan which includes all of the following elements:
    - (i) ensuring the sound management of the site, including defining objectives and indicators;
    - (ii) ensuring the preservation of the site and its transmission to future generations in accordance with the relevant protection regimes;
    - (iii) ensuring the quality of the reception facilities such as the historical presentation, visitors' information and signposting;
    - (iv) ensuring access for the widest possible public, inter alia, through site adaptations or staff training;
    - (v) according special attention to young people, in particular by granting them privileged access to the site;
    - (vi) promoting the site as a sustainable tourism destination;
    - (vii) developing a coherent and comprehensive communication strategy highlighting the European significance of the site;
    - (viii) ensuring that the management of the site is as environmentally friendly as possible.
2. As regards the criteria laid down in points (b) and (c) of paragraph 1, each site shall be assessed in a proportionate manner, taking into account its characteristics.

## TAKING STOCK FOR 2018

2018 is the *European Year for Cultural Heritage*. Within this perspective, and after four selection years and one monitoring year of the *European Heritage Label*, the Panel held a brainstorming during its last meeting on 16-17 October 2017 to take stock of the work carried out so far and to reflect on its vision for the *European Heritage Label* by 2030. 2018 will also be an evaluation year for the *European Heritage Label*. The Panel hopes that its reflections will provide food for thought for the candidate sites, the *EHL sites* and all stakeholders.

### EUROPEAN VALUES & PRINCIPLES

The *European Heritage Label* is not about the value of cultural heritage itself or about its uniqueness. It is about meeting three distinct criteria which are new: explaining the European dimension of a site, presenting a project to explain this European dimension to European audiences, and having the capacity to carry out this project. All types of cultural heritage are concerned. The focus is on the relevance for people. It turns out that new skills are required to contextualise the significance of sites in a wider European framework. This inevitably leads to making links with current challenges for Europe and in Europe, and putting these into perspective.

It is significant that all candidate sites and *EHL sites* want to be European. Whether or not, they analysed their European dimension in depth, they are driven by the wish to communicate the common values and principles that underpin the European project and identity. To put it in their own words, they are "*meeting the past and walking to the future*"<sup>2</sup>. As such the sites are examples of the heritage communities defined in the *Faro Convention*<sup>3</sup>.

*"Education and culture are the key to the future – both for the individual as well as for our Union as a whole. It is how we turn circumstance into opportunity, how we turn mirrors into windows and how we give roots to what it means to be 'European', in all its diversity. When Europe's leaders meet in Gothenburg this week, we must seize the opportunity and make sure education and culture are the drivers for job creation, economic growth, social fairness and ultimately unity."*

*M. Juncker, 14 November 2017*

*M. Juncker, President of the European Commission, receiving a Doctor Honoris Causa degree at the Coimbra University, whose library is a European Heritage Label Site (Instagram European Commission)*



### A STRONG NETWORK OF EHL SITES

According to *article 7-1-b-iv of Decision 1194/2011/EU*, the *European Heritage Label* is not just about individual sites that meet a set of three criteria but the *EHL sites* must take part "*in the activities of networks of sites awarded the label in order to exchange experiences and initiate common projects.*" The requirement for networking is also a very distinctive element of the *European Heritage Label*.

---

<sup>2</sup> Intervention by a *EHL site* during the *European Heritage Label week* in 2016, recalled during the awarding ceremony for the *EHL sites* selected in 20015, in: *2016 Panel Report on Monitoring*, p 41

<sup>3</sup> Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, CETS No 199, 25 October 2005

Without a dynamic and well functioning comprehensive network of the *EHL sites*, the *European Heritage Label* will remain an empty box. Particular helpful to strengthening partnerships and co-operative activities is the *European Heritage Label Week*, organised in conjunction with the award ceremony and/or EU Presidency conferences.

Given that no funding is attached to obtaining the *European Heritage Label* itself, the Panel recommends that consideration be given to providing some financial support to the *EHL network*. In addition to the yearly encounters, the *EHL network* could for example manage a grant system for cooperation between *EHL sites* and to help each other to promote their European significance. Creating an enabling and supportive environment for the *EHL sites* and the *EHL network* is of crucial importance.

## 2018 - EUROPEAN YEAR FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE: WHICH ROLE FOR THE EHL SITES?

The *European Heritage Label* was the first EU action with the explicit aim of bringing the European dimension of our cultural heritage to the fore. Not surprisingly, it has generated from its very beginnings a lot of reflection and research from the academic community and heritage practitioners. What is the European dimension of the cultural heritage? What happened in other European countries in other sites at the same period? Can heritage be shared? Can the heritage experience be shared? What is the relevance for our society today? What is the impact on the life of the citizens?

The Panel has always considered the *EHL sites* as 'gates' to information and further questioning. It is expected that *2018 - European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH)*, will increase interest in the European dimension of our cultural heritage not only from academics and practitioners but from the general public. The *EHL sites* being exemplar in opening up their European significance to European audiences, they should play a special role during *EYCH*, especially since the slogan of the year "*Where the past meets the future*" is in line with the "*Meeting the past and walking to the future*" motto of the *EHL sites*.

A first step to increase the awareness about the Label would be to use *EYCH* to present the *European Heritage Label* more prominently on the European Commission's webpage and its social media. The *EHL sites* should be given visibility by the European institutions when they communicate about the *EYCH*. Furthermore, the institutions, their representatives and their communication departments should use the examples of the *EHL sites* when they explain current challenges for Europe for which the *EHL sites* can provide contextual information. But the *EHL sites* themselves should take things in hand as well. They should use the *EYCH*, the *European Heritage Days* and social media to make themselves and the *EHL network* better known. "*The 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage will be an opportunity to increase awareness of the importance of culture and cultural heritage and, in particular, to recall that cultural heritage belongs to all*"<sup>4</sup>.

*"Through thick and thin, I have never lost my love of Europe. But there is rarely love without pain. Love for Europe because Europe and the European Union have achieved something unique in this fraying world: peace within and outside of Europe. Prosperity for many if not yet for all. This is something we have to remember during the European Year of Cultural Heritage. 2018 must be a celebration of cultural diversity."*

*M. Juncker, 13 September 2017*

*"I believe that cultural heritage is a crucial part of our identity, a valuable resource from the past which can and must help us look to the future together."*

*M. Navracsics, 15 November 2017*



---

<sup>4</sup> Strengthening European Identity through Education and Culture: The European Commission's contribution to the Leaders' meeting in Gothenburg, 17 November 2017, Communication from the European Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, COM (2017) 673 final

## EHL SITES, EDUCATION & RESEARCH

The *EHL sites* have an enormous potential for education as demonstrated during the 2016 monitoring year<sup>5</sup>. To unlock this potential:

- The European significance of the EHL sites should be clearly articulated in educational programmes;
- Educational programs should not only focus on school students and young people, but target visitors of all ages and families;
- Specific educational material should be developed which is different from publications presenting the sites;
- Educational material should be translated into other European languages, in particular the languages of the region and the languages of the peoples who created the heritage;
- Educational activities should not be confused with general communication activities; and
- Education activities should be assessed regularly to improve and enrich the educational strategy of the site.

In doing so, the *EHL sites* will contribute to the establishing of "a European Education Area based on trust, mutual recognition, cooperation and exchange of best practices, mobility and growth, via (...) preserving cultural heritage and fostering a sense of a European identity and culture" as proposed by the European Commission in its recent communication<sup>6</sup>.

Although the *European Heritage Label* is a recent action, there is already a considerable interest to conduct research into the action itself. Whilst this is premature, the Panel observed that the *European Heritage Label* has unlocked, or contributed to unlocking, new areas of research on for example: the European dimension of the *EHL sites*, the co-existence of different significances (local, region, national, European), different readings of cultural heritage and heritage interpretation in a European perspective, heritage experiences and ways to share such experiences, new ways of participatory governance (between the 'top down' or 'bottom up' approaches), and ways to put this into practise.

TEMA+, an Erasmus Mundus European Master's Programme entitled *Heritage and Development* was selected for the period of 2017-2022 to establish a training and research programme on European cultural heritage in cooperation with *EHL sites*. The members of the TEMA+ Consortium are *Eötvös Loránd University* of Budapest (coordinator), *Charles University* of Prague, *École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales* of Paris, *Laval University* of Quebec and *University of Catania*. The bilingual (English and French) programme serves as a pilot project to promote a global dispersion of methods and knowledge related to European cultural heritage embodied in the *European Heritage Label* through the network of TEMA+ scholars, experts and students.

The Panel is aware that cultural heritage can also be misused to rewrite history or to glorify some cultures and to oppress others. The Panel has a cautious approach about claims in general. The Panel recommends that candidate sites and *EHL sites* seek cooperation with academics to ensure that their narratives and activities are grounded on established facts and on the latest progress in science.

## LEARNING CURVE

The *European Heritage Label* is still in an initial phase. There is an interesting mix of candidate sites willing to participate, although they know that they will not get any funding. Any positive signal, such as the organisation of the yearly *EHL Week* or other meetings is therefore much appreciated by the *EHL sites*.

To increase the awareness of the *European Heritage Label* with potential candidate sites, it may be worth to ask the *Creative Europe Desks* to provide information on the Label as well.

The Member States who make the preselection, also provide support in various forms to their candidate sites. To better explain the key concepts of the Label, they may wish to develop a 'trainer the trainer' initiative with the European Commission; the Panel has prepared an outline for such an initiative.

The transition years are now over and the *European Heritage Label* has embarked on its regular calendar of a selection every other year, a four-year monitoring and a six-year evaluation cycle. This seems to be working fine.

---

<sup>5</sup> See the 2016 Panel Report on Monitoring

<sup>6</sup> Communication COM(2017) 673 final already mentioned

The Panel has been working well with the EHL Legal Basis and when necessary explained its interpretation of the provisions. Most of the Panel's suggestions included in this and previous reports, can be accommodated within the current legal framework. Should a change of the legal basis be considered at some point in the future, due attention should be given to extending the action to incorporate the whole of Europe's territory - regardless of other agreements - since the history and culture of Europe does not stop at the borders of the EU or such agreements, and to abolish the limitation of maximum one site per Member State per selection year.

### 10 recommendations - a summary

1. That the *EHL network* receive funding to develop cooperation projects, to share knowledge, to promote the European significance of the sites and to communicate on the *European Heritage Label*. The *EHL network* may also provide grants to *EHL sites* to reinforce their operational capacity and to develop educational activities and the use of (regional) languages.
2. That candidate sites receive support for preparing their application.
3. That the *European Heritage Label* is presented in a more user-friendly and prominent way on the European Commission's website and in the activities conducted at European level in the framework of *2018 - European Year of Cultural Heritage*.
4. That the European institutions and Member States use *EHL sites* to provide contextual information when they explain current challenges in Europe and for Europe. Their communication departments and persons in charge of the social media should be familiar with the *EHL sites* and their signification and make ample use of the *EHL sites* in their communication and on social media.
5. That the *EHL sites* and the *EHL network* participate in *2018 - European Year for Cultural Heritage*, that they cooperate with the *European Heritage Days (EHD)* at local and at European level: they organise a special activity during the EHD. The *EHL sites network* makes use of social media.
6. That the *EHL sites* strengthen their educational activities - as a pilot project within the framework of the proposed *European Area of Education*.
7. That the *EHL sites* seek cooperation with academics to ensure that their narratives and activities relate to a contemporary perspective on European contexts, and are grounded on established facts and on the latest progress in science.
8. That the *Creative Europe Desks* in the Member States are well informed about the *European Heritage Label* and provide basic information on the Label to their audiences.
9. That the National Coordinators and the European Commission organise 'Train the trainer' sessions to improve the knowledge of the key concepts and principles of the *European Heritage Label*.
10. Should the legal basis be reviewed, consideration is given to extending the scope of the *European Heritage Label* to the whole territory of Europe, and to abolishing the limitation of maximum one site per Member State per selection year.

## OTHER CANDIDATE SITES

### Mértola Historical Centre

MERTOLA (PORTUGAL)

5TH CENTURY BCE - PRESENT

#### Description

Mértola is located in the Alentejo region of Portugal. It is a fortified town which owes its foundation and development to its location. Situated on the river Guadiana, it has been famous since antiquity as an important fluvial trading port, the “last Mediterranean port,” fostering the circulation of people, goods, ideas, and knowledge. Its rich archaeological heritage and historic buildings cover many centuries and include, among others the Roman House, the Chapel and Necropolis of St Sebastiao, the Paleochristian Basilica, the old walls and remains of the port.

#### European significance

Mértola has a strategic importance and cross-border significance. Its rich historic heritage and thematic museums attest to its importance at the time as a fluvial trading port and a bridging place between Europe and North Africa. As such, it is similar to other places in the Mediterranean. The relationships between the trade and intercultural exchanges and the specific importance of Mértola’s European significance is not explained or conveyed. The application does not demonstrate the level of European significance required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label .

#### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The project is focused on the historic city and its hinterland, and includes activities aiming to promote the historic and cultural aspects of the place.

These activities include training courses, research programs, exhibitions, artistic events, cultural exchanges, participation in museum networks etc. Actions are also targeted at different social groups. Using established cultural partnerships and exchanges, Mértola will intensify its European network to stimulate contemporary creativity. Due to the high numbers of tourists, plans are in place to improve visitor reception services. The project is directed mainly at setting up a communication and digital marketing strategy rather than at transmitting the European significance of the site to European audiences. The submitted project does not meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label

#### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The management strategy, led by the municipality, addresses the preservation, rehabilitation and dissemination of the cultural heritage of Mértola by creating or enhancing “smart destinations” to reinforce ecological consciousness and to promote Mértola as a “museum village”. Its monuments and archaeology is protected under Portuguese law. The municipality has an adequate operating budget supplemented by European grant support, publication and ticket sales, etc. The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to manage the site.

#### Recommendation

The rich archaeological and cultural heritage of Mértola testify to its historical strategic location and its role as a place of intercultural exchange between Europe and North Africa. However, the application does not meet the qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## Ancient Plovdiv Architectural and Historical Reserve

PLOVDIV (BULGARIA)

2ND CENTURY BCE – 19TH CENTURY

### Description

Ancient Plovdiv Architectural and Historical Reserve is located on three hills in the central part of Plovdiv, one of the oldest cities in Europe, now in Western Bulgaria. Significant monuments from the second century BCE to the nineteenth century are evidence of its continuous existence through the ages. The city has been inhabited by populations of various ethnical, cultural and religious origins and was known under different names. In 1979 the site received the European gold medal for the preservation of its cultural heritage. It is an important destination for cultural tourism and Plovdiv will be the European Capital of Culture in 2019.

### European significance

Ancient Plovdiv Architectural and Historical Reserve is a site with important immovable and movable monuments: archaeological sites and finds, temples, residential houses, paintings, art objects, books etc. The influence of various European cultures is marked in the monuments of the late seventeenth to the nineteenth century. Plovdiv has been a crossroads of people and cultures and the application states that it is a place of cultural diversity and religious tolerance. However, the multicultural pan-European dimension of Plovdiv is shared by many cities in this part of Central and Eastern Europe. The application does not sufficiently differentiate the specific experience of Plovdiv and as such the European significance is not clearly expressed and articulated in the site's narrative. The application does not demonstrate the level of European significance required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The project aims to accentuate the importance of the cultural heritage of Ancient Plovdiv as a part of a common European heritage. Tasks to improve multilingualism in three major European languages, visitor facilities and specific activities for the provision of a digital online platform about the immovable and the movable cultural goods of the site will be available throughout Europe. However, there is no evidence to show if the different nationalities and their heritage at the core of this site's intercultural character are involved or included in the project. In addition, the project does not focus on communicating the European dimension to European audiences but is primarily oriented on enhancing sustainable tourism. The submitted project does not meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The management of the site is carried out by the Ancient Plovdiv Municipal Institute, and supported by the local authority. The monuments are protected under Bulgarian national law. The management aims to protect the historic environment and the local traditions and to reinforce sustainable tourism. Restoration works have been carried out using State and local funding, European subsidies and private donations. As one of the Cultural Capitals of Europe in 2019, a new communication strategy with improved visitor publications and facilities is planned. The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to manage the site.

### Recommendation

Ancient Plovdiv Architectural and Historical Reserve has an important cultural heritage which reflects it is a place of encounter and co-existence. However, the application does not meet the qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## Archaeological Site of Monemvasia

### MONEMVASIA (GREECE)

#### 6TH CENTURY - PRESENT

##### Description

The castle town of Monemvasia, located on the south-eastern side of Peloponnese, is carved out of the side of a huge sea rock. Originally the only way to reach it was by means of a paved pathway connecting the castle entrance to the mainland, hence the meaning of its name: “single passage”. This port was one of the biggest trade centres in the Byzantine and subsequently Ottoman world from the sixth to the nineteenth century. Today the site consists of two parts: the Upper Town, the administrative centre containing a large number of monuments, and the Lower Town, an active settlement now grown into a well-known tourist resort. Monemvasia is also designated as part of the Natura 2000 network.

The remaining monuments of the Upper Town (castle, fortifications, 27 important churches, houses, public buildings, Ottoman hammams, cisterns) form an organised archaeological and historical site and a living architectural museum of the Byzantine, Venetian and Ottoman periods, which accommodates thousands of visitors each year.

##### European significance

Due to its strategic location and its role as a transit trade centre between the Italian cities, the ports of the Black Sea and the Eastern Mediterranean, Monemvasia constituted a gateway between Western Europe and the Byzantine Empire. Over the centuries, its inhabitants were described as Byzantine, Frankish, Venetian, Ottoman, Greek. Despite various changes in regime, the walled city became a place of cosmopolitan thinking where people of different religions lived together peacefully. For example during the post-Byzantine period from fifteenth to nineteenth centuries, Greeks, Latins and Ottomans coexisted in Monemvasia and attended Ottoman mosques or Catholic and Orthodox churches.

In addition to being a melting pot integrating different ethnicities and religions, Monemvasia enhanced common values on which Europe was built: multiculturalism, diversity, tolerance. Monemvasia has European significance. However these interesting elements are not well articulated or conveyed in the application.

##### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The project presented in the application is focused on improving or continuing existing activities, relating to publications, translating material and websites. Through its educational programmes schools from Europe visit Monemvasia to study fortification architecture and the site is also active in European initiatives such as the European Heritage Days, and “Environment and Culture”. Worthy though these activities are, the whole project does not relate strongly to the European significance of the site. The submitted project does not meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

##### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The archaeological site of Monemvasia is protected under Greek legislation and is under the jurisdiction of the Ephorate of Antiquities of Lakonia, part of Ministry of Culture. There is a numerous and highly skilled team. The applicant does participate in a number of cross-border and European projects however the application does not clearly show how raising awareness of the European dimension of the site will be carried out. As such the application does not demonstrate the level of organisational capacity required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

##### Recommendation

Although Monemvasia has a rich cultural and archaeological heritage due to its strategic location, the application in its present form does not meet the qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## Sites of Great Moravia

### MIKULČICE – KOPČANY ARCHAEOLOGICAL PARK (CZECH REPUBLIC AND SLOVAKIA)

#### 8TH-9TH CENTURY

##### Description

"Sites of Great Moravia" is a transnational application between the Czech Republic and Slovakia consisting of a single site which straddles the border between the two countries. It is formed from the main part of the Mikulčice – Kopčany agglomeration which, in the ninth century AD, constituted one of the major centres of the state known as Great Moravia. The Czech part of the site includes the early medieval Slavic fortified settlement in Mikulčice, a national cultural monument; the Slovak part includes the Church of St. Margaret of Antioch complex in Kopčany.

##### European significance

In the first half of the ninth century, present-day Bohemia, Moravia and Slovakia became part of new Empire, called Great Moravia that united the west Slavic tribes politically and culturally. This transformation of central Europe, open to both Latin and Byzantine cultural influences, was accompanied by the newly created church organisation, by state administration and economic management. The cultural transformation of central Europe was accompanied by changes to its church organisation, state administration and economic management. The candidate site documents the intense cultural and economic contacts that existed in Europe in the early Middle Ages, supported by the new religion, Christianity. Despite its short existence, Great Moravia left behind a historical legacy through which Central Europe became an integral part of European culture. However, there are several important lacuna in the application: no meaningful reference is made to the archaeological research co-operation between European universities on the site, nor its connections to Saint Methodius and Cyril, with their role in eastern Slavic nations alphabet and literature. The European dimension is not well articulated in the application. Whilst the site has potential, the

application does not demonstrate the level of European significance required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

##### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The project is centred on creating a new cross-border cultural and educational destination within the Czech and Slovak Republics. Its purpose is to promote and spread, by developing various tourism forms, awareness of the significance and legacy of the Great Moravian Empire and the uniqueness of the Mikulčice – Kopčany Archaeological Park in all regions of Europe to visitors of all age and interest groups. Although the presented project is ambitious, the European dimension is not clearly presented, and the project is not sufficiently linked with the European significance. The submitted project does not meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

##### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The site is protected under Czech and Slovak law. The management of the site is ensured by the Working Group for Mikulčice–Kopčany Archaeological Park. The Hodonín branch of the Masaryk Museum is responsible for the Czech part of the site while the Slovak part of the site is in the charge of the municipality of Kopčany and by the Záhorské Museum in Skalica. There is a management plan for the site, supported by funding from both states. However, the initiative may require a stronger form of governance than a working group and the proposed budget appears too low to allow the achievement of the proposed goals. The application does not demonstrate the level of organisational capacity required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

##### Recommendation

Despite many interesting aspects of the "The Sites of Great Moravia", the application in its present form does not meet the qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## Oradea Fortress

ORADEA, ROMANIA

11TH -18TH CENTURY

### Description

Oradea (Nagyvarad) located in western Romania, evolved out of a fortified Romanesque monastery founded in the 10<sup>th</sup> century. In the course of several periods of rebuilding in the late Renaissance and Baroque times, the fortress was given a regular pentagonal shape with extending bastions. In the fortress complex part of Princely Palace dating from 1629 has survived as well as a late Baroque church from 1775. The fortress played an important part in the history of central Europe defending it against the Mongols in 13<sup>th</sup> century and later Turkish invasions. In Renaissance times it became a regional centre of humanism and a number of respected Italian architects and engineers participated in its construction and remodelling. Important Hungarian monarchs and other personalities were buried in its church.

### European significance

Because of its strategic importance the fortress of Oradea acted as a shield against eastern invasion for Hungary and Transylvania. As a burial place of king Ladislau I the Holy and the bishopric it played an important part in Hungarian and Romanian religious and cultural life in the late Middle Ages and Renaissance period. Oradea functioned as a place of encounter and exchange of ideas and artistic concepts from different parts of Europe. However, this experience was no greater than many other centres of multi-ethnic character and eventful history situated in this part of Europe. While Oradea is certainly of significance for its Hungarian and Romanian history, culture and military architecture and may have potential, the application does not demonstrate the level of European significance required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The project builds on recent plans for the site which outline an ambitious programme to make the site more attractive for visitors and tourists, including the promotion of the site by websites and social media, enlarging the multilingual presentation, educational programmes, conferences, Open Air Film Festival, art and historical exhibitions. In some aspects the programmes have an aspirational character and, more importantly it would be desirable to formulate more clearly how the European dimension will be incorporated into the site's narrative and tied into the presentation and educational activities. At present the submitted project does not meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Organisational capacity (work plan)

Oradea Fortress is protected at national level under Romanian heritage law. It is run by the Municipality of Oradea through the Fortress Management System and the Museum of the Fortress and City of Oradea. The current resourcing situation is sufficient; however, the planned 300% rise in visitor numbers will require increases in staff and income. The application does not demonstrate the level of organisational capacity required under the criteria for European Heritage Label.

### Recommendation

Although Oradea Fortress has a high level of regional historical significance, the application in its present form does not meet the qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## Bussaco Cultural Heritage Site

### BUSSACO (PORTUGAL)

c. 1000 -1810

#### Description

Bussaco is a forest in the centre of Portugal which has been landscaped over four centuries with a huge number of native and exotic trees from all continents, brought back by sailors from voyages linked to Portuguese colonial history. It covers 105 ha and contains an outstanding range of biodiversity. In the centre of Bussaco sits a Discalced Carmelite convent built in 1628. The "Bussaco Cultural Heritage Site" is composed of the convent,- a monument partly converted into a palace-hotel, and nearly 50 buildings and associated structures: hermitages, devotional chapels, architectural fountains, crosses, etc, disseminated throughout the forest. The Convent was a so-called "desert," i.e. a remote and isolated monastic site. A Papal bull issued by Pope Urban VIII in 1643 threatened to excommunicate any person harming the trees. The Carmelites gave permission to notable European figures working within the natural sciences to visit and study the site. In 1810, Bussaco was the stage of a battle of the Napoleonic wars. The site is listed on Portugal's Tentative List for UNESCO World Heritage.

#### European significance

The Discalced Carmelites had convents all over Europe with a supranational organisation. Many scientific expeditions were headed to Bussaco, led by illustrious scientists like Gabriel Grisey or Johann von Hofmannsegg. The military episode during the Napoleonic wars of the battle between the Duke of Wellington and the army of Marshal Masséna is called Battle of Bussaco.

The "Bussaco Cultural Heritage Site" is an extraordinary example of the sensibility for a designed landscape that embraces the dimensions of beauty and diversity, *Heimat* or sense of place and exotism, mysticism, and the sense of the sublime forces of nature. This culturally designed poetry of nature was supervised most of the time by the spiritual and practical care of Carmelite friars. In two

instances papal bulls intervened in favour of the preservation of the site. The exotic biodiversity of Bussaco is closely linked to contributions of the Portuguese colonial past. Furthermore, the 19th century landscape and built legacy is an important testimony for the origins of tourism in Portugal. However, although the site represents a spiritual concept that resonates with modern day environmental concerns, its European significance is not well articulated. The application does not demonstrate the level of European significance required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

#### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The project is focused mainly on biodiversity awareness and the effects of climate change. In 2013 and 2014, two cyclones devastated about 40% of the forest. An educational and recreative trail is planned crossing 27 trees struck by the storms of 2013 and 2014. Artists will sculpt out of the dead left trunks some historical and cultural themes on Bussaco and European values such as freedom, democracy, tolerance, solidarity. The submitted project consists mainly of an artistic event which is not related to the European significance of the site and therefore does not meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

#### Organisational capacity (work plan)

Bussaco is classified as a "property of public interest" and has applied for reclassification as a national monument. The site is managed by the Bussaco Foundation, a public foundation under private management. The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to manage the site.

#### Recommendation

Bussaco Cultural Heritage Site is a unique symbol of the European sensibility that links our cultural identity(ies) and the landscapes in which they are embedded. However, the application in its present form does not meet all the qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## Historical Centre of Turaida

SIGULDA (LATVIA)

13TH -20TH CENTURY

### Description

The Historical Centre of Turaida located in central Latvia, is a diverse site made up of five elements: Turaida medieval castle, the Folk Song Park at Dainu Hill, the Cultural and Historical Heritage of Gauja Livs (one of ancient tribes of Latvian nation), the Church Hill and Wooden Church (1750), one of the oldest of its kind in the country, and the Economic Centre of Turaida with 21 historic buildings explaining the evolution of the feudal estate system of the Baltic German aristocratic landowners up to the early twentieth century. In addition, the castle was the residence of the Archbishops of Riga from the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries and the Folk Song Park is linked to the Singing Revolution of the 1980s, and the Memory of the World. These five elements were designated as a single museum complex in 1988 consisting of 48 indoor and outdoor exhibitions.

### European significance

The character of Historic Centre of Turaida is, by its nature, multiethnic and multicultural. It tells the typically European story of how smaller ethnic groups are melded into bigger ones, the importance of the introduction of Christianity for the development of European culture and civilisation, and the devastating impacts of religious intolerance and imperial expansions. The important intangible value of the site is connected to the folk songs and culture of the past and present, the folk myths and legends. However interesting these elements are, the application does not articulate a clear European dimension or context for the site. Although the site communicates European values in a specific form to domestic and international audiences, the application does not demonstrate the level of European significance required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project).

The Historical Centre of Turaida developed a broad range of exhibitions and cultural activities that supply the visitors with extensive information about the site and its links to European history, the living traditions and multiethnic folklore and art creation. The programmes are presented in admirably multilingual forms (minimal in three, but up to ten European languages) with the project to present the Map - Guide in all living languages of Europe. Impressing is the use of modern information technologies. A variety of events are organised on the museum premises inclusive international folk festivals, the summer archaeological camps for domestic and foreign students, regional as well as international conferences devoted to the history, archaeology, folk culture and other topics. The site collaborates with a number of artists and enables the exhibition of their work. Despite all these rich activities, the project is not sufficiently focused on bringing the European significance of the site to European audiences. The submitted project does not meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Organisation capacity (work plan)

Since 1994 Turaida has been protected as the only specially protected monument in Latvian law. It is run by the Turaida Museum Reserve, under the responsibility of the Latvian Ministry of Culture. It is financed by this ministry and by its own revenues and paid services. The Museum has won a number of awards and is sufficiently staffed and resourced. The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to manage the site.

### Recommendation

While Turaida represents the diversity of the roots of European cultural history and its multiculturalism the application in its present form does not meet the qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## Imperial Palace

INNSBRUCK (AUSTRIA)

15TH -18TH CENTURY

### Description

The Imperial Palace in Innsbruck in western Austria was the main residence of Maximilian (1459-1519) who married Mary of Burgundy. It was remodelled into a Baroque palace by Maria Theresa in the eighteenth century. The complex consists a fifteenth century fortress with the Silver Chapel, the Noble Women's Collegiate Foundation (by Maria Theresa in 1765), and the court garden. Coming into the ownership of the Austrian Republic in 1919, it is regarded as the third most historical building in Austria after the Hofburg Vienna, and the Schonbrunn Palace.

### European significance

The significance of the site is derived from the modernising changes started by Maximilian I whose perception of the role of Emperor was altered substantially by his encounter with the Burgundian political and economic system. From this, he promoted early modern thought and artistic philosophical scientific knowledge - humanism and printing, both of which he used to promote his own image as ruler. In addition, he promoted new forms of financial authority and control such as double entry book keeping. His marriage was formative for the Habsburg monarchy under which much of central and Eastern Europe was ruled. The European dimension is not well-articulated in the site's narrative mainly because of the strong focus on Maximilian I instead of exploring wider connections to a line of rulers, events or European historic, philosophic, or cultural movements as in the case of the Hofburg in Vienna.

The application does not demonstrate the level of European significance required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The main action of the project is a new exhibition on the reign of Maximilian I marking the 500-year anniversary of his death and an interpretation of his rule as a "turning point" towards modernity.

The development of interactive digital games about Maximilian for younger people is a strong point. However, the project would have benefited from greater depth of exploration of the European dimension and greater ambition in presenting to a wider European audience. The submitted project does not meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The Imperial Palace is protected under Austrian Federal law. The palace is managed by the BHOe who manages the other two imperial sites in Austria. Their budget and staffing capacity is stable and provides for regular maintenance of this complex. The BHOe has adopted principles of sustainable cultural heritage management, balancing the needs of their buildings against those of tourism etc. The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to manage the site.

### Recommendation

While the Imperial Palace (Innsbruck) is a starting point to develop some innovative activities such as the use of online games to interpret history, the application does not meet the qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## Revitalized Fortresses of Šibenik

### SIBENIK (CROATIA)

#### 15TH CENTURY

##### Description

Šibenik, a coastal city in Croatia, is recognisable by its four fortresses. Two of them (St. Michael's and Barone) have been revitalized in recent years, and a third restoration project (St. John's) was commenced in 2016.

The "Revitalised Fortresses of Šibenik" have become centres of cultural life as well as important tourism sites. They have also contributed to the improvements of social standards and the local economy as well as the overall quality of life of the citizens.

##### European significance

The history of Šibenik is a story of Mediterranean culture, trade networks, communal and proto-democratic evolution as well as interlocked cultural and societal patterns. These start with the *limes maritimus* of the sixth century, to the Venetian State of the fifteenth century to today's European Union. The fortresses of Šibenik have a cross-border nature and their past influence and today's attraction extend beyond the national borders of Croatia. With the recent restoration projects, the "Revitalised Fortresses of Šibenik" are today examples of creative and sustainable cultural management of historical sites. Despite these points, the European dimension is not being conveyed and articulated in the site's narrative. While the "Revitalised Fortresses" of Šibenik have important historic as well as socio-economic values, the application does not demonstrate the level of European significance required under the criteria for European Heritage Label.

##### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The intention of the project is to increase the value of heritage and its role in sustainable economic growth and regional development, and also to define a strategy for the European market as well as training of employees on the European Heritage Label. The main actions include educational activities targeting specific groups including young people and stakeholders, in order to improve the understanding of common European history and civilisation, and local history, and finally increasing the number of artistic and cultural activities. Whilst there is a willingness to make the European dimension of the fortresses better known, this is not fully reflected in the proposed programme of activities. The submitted project does not meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

##### Organisational capacity (work plan)

Each of the Šibenik fortresses is protected by the Ministry of Culture as an immovable asset of the Republic of Croatia. The municipality of Šibenik is responsible for the management of the site. The objectives are mainly to revitalise the unrestored parts, present and interpret the fortification system, and develop cultural activities. The application does not demonstrate the level of organisational capacity required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

##### Recommendation

The legacy of the Revitalised Fortresses of Šibenik is of historic importance, however the application does not meet the qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## Two fortresses – One Hero

OLD ZRINSKI TOWN ČAKOVEC (CROATIA)  
SZIGETVÁRI ZRÍNYI VÁR (HUNGARY)

1566

### Description

This transnational application consists of the Old Town of Čakovec, the fortified castle of the Zrinski family and the fort of Szigetvár. They lie about 130 km apart in southern Hungary and central Croatia. In 1566 Nikola IV Zrinski was the leader of a small force that heroically defended the little fortress of Szigetvár against the far more numerous troops of the Ottoman leader Suleiman the Magnificent. The siege of Szigetvár ended in victory for the Turks after a last heroic and desperate sortie of every member of the garrison including Nikola IV. During the siege Suleiman the Magnificent died, a fact that was concealed from his troops for several weeks. The battle at Szigetvár delayed the Ottoman advance on Vienna for several decades.

### European significance

While the two fortresses are not exceptional as monuments on their own, they are linked to an event of European significance and a personality of symbolic importance. Nikola IV represents the historical defence of the West against the Ottoman Empire. The conflict with the Ottomans on European territory was a significant military, political and religious challenge for Christian Europe from the sixteenth to the beginning of the nineteenth century. The memory of Nikola IV is an iconic episode in this period. The narratives proposed in the application emphasise the defence of freedom, democracy and contemporary European values. As recent excavations show, the heart of Suleiman the Magnificent was buried at Szigetvár, where a place of remembrance has been set up jointly with Turkey. Whilst the site has potential European significance, the European dimension was not well-articulated at present and needs to be more comprehensive. For example, the poetic achievements of Nikola IV in both Hungarian and Croatia would also be worthy of exploration. The application does not demonstrate the level of European significance required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

Both sub-sites plan to strengthen their cross-border cooperation and to make the figure of Nikola IV better known to European audiences because, at present, both sites are better known with at a national level. Other proposed joint initiatives include a European Youth open day, an expert meeting on the preservation of heritage and translation of material in Croatian, Hungarian and English into other European languages. However, the European dimension of the transnational site is not in the foreground of the proposed activities. The submitted project does not meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Organisational capacity (work plan)

Both fortresses have subsequently been damaged and restored several times and today both are museums. The architectural complex of the Old Town Zrinski in Čakovec is managed by the Museum of Međimurje Čakovec, located within the complex, and the municipality of Međimurje County is financially responsible for the site. The Castle of Szigetvár is owned by the Hungarian State and managed by the National Asset Management agency. The Municipality of Szigetvár is currently operating the Castle under lease agreement. While both sites have sufficient capacity for their own work, the application does not include a related management strategy for this candidature. The application does not demonstrate the level of organisational capacity required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

### Recommendation

The two fortresses in the Old Town of Čakovec and the fort of Szigetvár, which are linked to Nikola IV Zrinski and the Szigetvár battle, have the potential to unlock an important part of the European history. However, the application in its present form does not meet the qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## Coudenberg Palace

BRUSSELS (BELGIUM)

12TH -18TH CENTURY

### Description

The archaeological site of the Coudenberg Palace is located in the heart of Brussels, in the centre of Belgium. The site includes the remains of the old Palace of Charles V and other constructions (the Palatine Chapel, Aula Magna, rue Isabelle, Hoogstraeten House). These buildings were built between the twelfth century until 1731 when the palace was accidentally destroyed by fire, and subsequently demolished to create Place Royale. The large-scale (3,000m<sup>2</sup>) site, made up of basements, cellars and street surfaces, is accessible to visitors along with a display of over 200 objects.

### European significance

Coudenberg was the royal palace of Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy and later, the rulers of the Habsburg Empire including Charles V, who ruled much of western Europe including Burgundy, Spain, Austria, France, the Low Countries. During this period Brussels was an important political and diplomatic centre. The Dukes of Burgundy and the Habsburgs were also extravagant patrons of the arts with the resultant dissemination of European art and intellectual movements through their territories. The site today provides a tangible link to the oft-concealed importance of the Duchy of Burgundy and the Spanish Netherlands. These layers of European history have been revealed in the past thirty years through archaeological excavations, which in a remarkable presentation, demonstrate the strength of archaeology in reconnecting us in a tangible way with the past.

The candidate site meets the criteria for European significance required for the European Heritage label.

### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The project, "C for Coudenberg," offers a transnational glimpse of history for visitors of all ages. The proposed project is ambitious and will use thematic approaches (Europe's Courts, sovereignty, palace architecture, diplomacy, cultural and artistic exchange) to present the European significance of the site. It will include a virtual and three-dimensional representation of the destroyed buildings and a temporary exhibition (physical or virtual) devoted to Coudenberg collections now found in other European museums and collections. The submitted project meets the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The site is managed by a not for profit organisation, and supported by the Region of Brussels-Capital and the City of Brussels which secure the funding for the running costs. The monuments are protected under law of the Brussels-Capital Region. The archaeological site and the museum are subject to constant monitoring and respect the Code of Ethics of ICOM and ICOMOS. The site works in partnership with other museums and institutions and has coped well with the increasing number of visitors since the opening of the site. The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to implement the submitted project and meets the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Recommendation

Coudenberg Palace reveals the hidden layers and interconnections of European history and bears witness to the complex political, cultural, religious and economic history of Europe before the formation of nineteenth century nation states. The Coudenberg Palace in Brussels, Belgium meets all the criteria required for the European Heritage Label. However, in application of Article 11-2 of the Decision establishing the European Heritage Label, the Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## Eight Estonian and Latvian Manors

(LATVIA AND ESTONIA)

18TH -20TH CENTURY

### Description

This is transnational, multiple-site, application focused on the heritage of the manorial system in present day Estonia and Latvia. It brings together eight manors: Raikküla, Kõue, Liepa, Belava, Sangaste, Lasila, Kukruse and Kiltsi. Established as a result of the Northern crusades of the thirteenth century, the original forts evolved into extensive landed estates many owned by Baltic Germans. During the eighteenth century, many landowners remodelled their homes or built anew in the neo-classical style, reflecting their connections to European cultural movements. Despite frequent changes in political regimes, the Estonian and Livonian provinces remained under the control of more than 200 noble families, with a network of manor houses and their lands - 1200 in Estonia and 1470 in Latvia. After independence of Estonia and Latvia in 1918, the principal function of the manor houses changed, converting to schools, as well a variety of other institutions ranging from children's homes, hotels, and cultural centres. Today, many of these manors still play a leading role in the life of rural areas and their various architectural styles blend harmoniously into a landscape of lakes, pastureland and forest.

### European significance

As aristocratic residences, these Baltic manors reflect the cultural mood of different epochs and in particular of the Enlightenment. The re-use of these buildings is specific in each case, and their new social functions reconcile the history of coloniser landed gentry and the locality. However, the European significance is not readily apparent in the application. This phenomenon of landed gentry acting as intermediaries for new trends in culture and thought is to be found across Europe with many examples of castles and manor houses which were home to individuals who contributed substantially to European scientific discovery, literature, music or philosophy etc. More importantly, a common narrative linking the heritage of this manorial system to a deeper European context is required.

Whilst the site has potential, the application does not demonstrate the level of European significance required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The application contains a thematic framework to shape the common project, under which each site works according to its abilities. While the promotion of Estonian and Latvian manors is carried out by the different owners of each site, joint promotion will happen mainly through a dedicated website, that will serve to attract more tourists to these sites. However, it is not clear how the European narrative will be incorporated into the educational activities of each manor. Without a common European narrative more firmly tied into it, the submitted project does not meet the criteria required for the Heritage Label.

### Organisational capacity (work plan)

Each of the 8 manors is a national monument protected under law. All are under separate management systems depending in their present function either private (hotels, reception venues) or public (municipalities, schools, museums). They all have staff permanently working on the premises, but not all of them have visitor reception facilities. No budget is assigned to common activities. While each of the eight manors has found its own audience (local pupils and visitors, or European tourists), it may be possible to build on the experience gained through federations such as the Estonian Manor Association, Estonian Manor School Association and Latvian Association of Manors and Castles, to increase operational capacity. Currently, the application does not demonstrate the level of organisational capacity required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

### Recommendation

While the Estonian and Latvian manors evolved as the result of European inter-connections, the application in its present form does not meet the qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## Lodz – Multicultural Landscape of an Industrial City

LODZ (POLAND)

19TH - EARLY 20TH CENTURY

### Description

"Lodz - Multicultural Landscape of an Industrial City" includes three museums and the Piotrkowska pedestrian street of culture. Lodz itself is a former centre of textile manufacturing located in the centre of Poland. From 1828 due to expansion of the textile industry, Lodz grew rapidly from a small hamlet into a large city, built by enterprising Germans, Jews, Poles, Russians and other national and ethnic groups aided by tariff-free access to the markets of the Russian Empire. Today the city includes sites that bear witness to the activity of eminent factory owners from various parts of Europe. The "Multicultural Landscape of an Industrial City" is represented by four eminent urban components: the layout of Piotrkowska Street and Wolnosci Square; Karol Scheibler's Palace; Izrael Poznanski's Palace; and Ludwik Gayer's White Factory. These elements from the very outset created a unique urban landscape and a constant reminder of its genesis.

### European significance

The multicultural landscape of Lodz as an industrial city emerged from the combined efforts of many nationalities and confessional groups. The cityscape represents the truly cross-border provenance of its population. Despite their different backgrounds, these people were able to communicate and work together, building their cooperation on compromises, respecting their diversity, and thus creating an industrial centre of European significance. The surviving buildings are specific symbols of multinational and multi-confessional Lodz, making it a city of a very special architectural landscape not just in Poland, but also in Europe. However, the European significance is not sufficiently articulated in the application. Important social aspects of a quickly industrialised and, later, painfully de-industrialised city are omitted. The potential of the multicultural landscape of Lodz is reflected in its built heritage but not adequately addressed in the application.

The identification of the core elements of the site as a landscape and how these elements construct a coherent entity deserve also more attention. Whilst the site has potential, the application does not demonstrate the level of European significance required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The primary objective of the project is to promote fundamental European values – respect of diversity, tolerance, openness to dialogue and to cooperation – embodied in the built heritage of the Industrial City of Lodz. The participating museums carry out their rich educational programme in the form of lessons, games, meetings, shows and exhibitions with special attention to the educational needs of younger people. Planned activities are designed to increase the access of the site to wider European audiences. However, the project lacks significant societal and historical characteristics, which are necessary to communicate the European dimension of the city, which are otherwise present for example, identifying the key elements of the proposed site as a landscape, and how these elements construct a unit of living heritage. The submitted project does not meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The three museums and the Piotrkowska pedestrian street of culture are financed and preserved by the Municipality of the City and by national authorities under Polish law. Lodz has an active presence in European cultural and urban networks. The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to manage the site.

### Recommendation

The heritage of Lodz as a Multicultural Landscape of an Industrial City has the potential to express its European significance. However, the application in its present form does not meet the qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## Zsolnay Cultural Quarter

PECS (HUNGARY)

1853

### Description

Zsolnay Cultural Quarter was established as part of the “Pécs - 2010 European Capital of Culture” project centred on the area of the ancient Zsolnay Porcelain Manufacture in Pecs in central Hungary. Founded in 1853 the Manufacture was awarded the Grand Prix of the 1878 Paris Expo. It became by the turn of the 19th century the most famous ceramic factory of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and contributed to developments in European applied arts and the modernist direction of industrial design. Zsolnay Cultural Quarter is nowadays a multi-functional architectural complex that combines preservation of historical heritage with contemporary artistic creation.

### European significance

The Zsolnay Porcelain Manufacture helped shape the architectural character of various central European cities during the nineteenth century. The colourful decorations and roof tiles made in its factory can still be found in various buildings in Budapest, Vienna, Bratislava and elsewhere. Thus the site, composed of rehabilitated industrial buildings and residential houses in Pecs, constitutes an example of this specific Central European architectural style. Additionally decorative household objects produced in the factory are evidence of the widespread blooming of the Art Nouveau movement in Europe. However, while the reopening of a disused porcelain factory for its original purpose assures its historical continuity, the application demonstrates primarily the national and regional importance of the site rather than its European dimension; the European significance is not clearly articulated in the site’s narrative. The application does not demonstrate the level of European significance required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The project includes the improvement of visitor facilities, translating information material in various European languages, reinforcing the presence of the site on the web and enhancing cultural exchanges. A virtual museum with the most representative ceramic products of the Zsolnay Manufacture is planned too. However, the activities relate more to the management of the site and do not focus sufficiently on communicating the European dimension to European audiences. The submitted project does not meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The management of the site is operated by the Zsolnay Heritage Management, a non-profit company founded by the Municipality of Pecs. The monuments are protected under Hungarian law since 2001. Funding is secured by the Government and by own revenues. The candidate site has adequate operational capacity to manage the site.

### Recommendation

The Zsolnay Cultural Quarter is an interesting example of a specific Central European architectural style from the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and of rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of a historic industrial complex. However, the application does not meet the qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## Westerplatte Battlefield

GDANSK (POLAND)

1939

### Description

Westerplatte is located in the north-eastern part of Gdansk on the Baltic coast of Poland. It is a historical battlefield, with historic buildings from the Military Transit Depot, many in need of maintenance or full restoration. Westerplatte battlefield is associated with the start of WWII, being the very place where Germany first attacked Poland in 1st September 1939. The newly established Museum of Westerplatte is at the preparatory stage of its permanent and seasonal exhibitions. Plans are also in place to restore the buildings, and at time of writing the application, archaeological excavations were being carried out.

### European significance

Westerplatte is linked with the history of one of the best known European ports, Gdańsk. It was an important sea port, part of the Hanseatic League as well as a centre of art and culture, referred to by Napoleon Bonaparte as the "Gibraltar of the North". Due to the battles which took place on Westerplatte during World War II, the peninsula is emblematic of the start of the second World War, and the heroism and tenacity in the fight against the totalitarian Nazi regime. In 1979, the defenders of Westerplatte met the German soldiers who attacked them in 1939, and in 2009, a meeting of representatives of 31 countries (including Russia, Germany, Ukraine and Sweden) was held here, to pay tribute to the victims of World War II. The candidate site meets the criteria for European significance required for the European Heritage Label but it is not possible to assess the narrative since the museum is only at a preparatory stage.

### Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The aim of the project entitled "WWII began on Westerplatte" is to raise awareness of Westerplatte among Europeans and especially young people. The project is focused on promoting the peaceful coexistence of sovereign states, and the protection of European values and principles. The proposed project is dependent on the availability of funding and, at time of consideration by the Panel, it was at the stage of being authorised by the responsible bodies, for implementation over the next four to five years. The Museum is still in the process of being set up. It is thus premature to assess. As a result, the submitted project does not meet the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Organisational capacity (work plan)

The site is owned by the National Treasury of Poland. The Museum of Westerplatte and the War of 1939 is a state cultural institution financed by the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage. It has the capacity to apply for financial assistance from both the national and European funding mechanisms. The Museum will oversee the completion of the key projects and the work being done. At this stage, it is premature to assess the operational capacity of the site with regard to the criteria required for the European Heritage Label.

### Recommendation

Westerplatte Battlefield is a significant place connected to World War II, but the Museum being at the planning and preparatory stages, the application does not meet the qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

# The Legacy of the Composer Bohuslav Martinů

POLIČKA (CZECH REPUBLIC)

20TH CENTURY

## Description

This site, located in Polička, a town in the centre of Czech Republic, is made up of a museum and research archive focused on the life and work of the composer Bohuslav Martinů. Martinů was born here in 1890 in the tower of Saint James church where his father was the bell ringer. Educated in Czechoslovakia, Martinů moved first to Paris in 1923 and then in 1941, he escaped to USA, having been a target of the Gestapo. From 1956 to his death in 1959, he chose to live outside communist Czechoslovakia. The Museum now works with international institutions to enhance the knowledge of the composer's work and to pass on his humanist message around Europe.

## European significance

Martinů is a composer of international importance, and his life and his inspirations were defined by the course of European history in the twentieth century. Three main trajectories of his life are identified in the application illustrating his humanist attitudes: his delight in new inventions and the modern era (e.g. the aeroplane), his rejection of totalitarian systems, and his search for his own origins. Despite these interesting elements, the European dimension of the composer and his music is not sufficiently developed or conveyed in the site's narrative. The application does not demonstrate the level of European significance required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

## Strengthening the communication of the European dimension to European audiences (project)

The project is focused on improving knowledge and appreciation of the composer's life and work through a new festival and musical performances in Polička and digital recordings. The development of educational programs is planned too using four aspects of the composer: "Martinů Family and the Life in the Tower"; "Martinů as a student", in the background of historical events and cultural life in early 20<sup>th</sup> century; "Martinů and Paris" focused on Paris as a centre of different art movements; and "Martinů, a traveller", which examines the diversity of cultures, traditions and values. The European dimension could be expressed more strongly and the project does not address the issue of presenting the music of Martinů to a wider European audience, in particular those people who may never visit Polička. The submitted project does not meet the criteria required for European Heritage Label.

## Organisational capacity (work plan)

Both the Museum and the Church of St James and its tower are protected under Czech law. The museum is supported by the municipality of Polička and both sites have financial support from regional and national sources as well as the Bohuslav Martinů Foundation. The main coordinator for the project is the municipal museum, working with other local organisations and the parish of St James Church, along with the International Martinů Circle in Prague and their international partners. It is unclear how all the organisations involved will co-ordinate their actions. The application does not demonstrate the level of operational capacity required under the criteria for the European Heritage Label.

## Recommendation

While the "Legacy of Bohuslav Martinů" has many intriguing aspects in relation to his life and the different dimensions of his music, the application does not meet qualifying criteria. The Panel recommends that this application does not receive the European Heritage Label.

## WORD OF THANKS

The Panel wishes to thank the twenty-five sites for their enthusiastic participation in the 2017 selection process. They contribute to a greater awareness of our cultural heritage, the elements that unite in diversity.

The Panel addresses its gratitude to the National Coordinators for their continuous efforts in explaining the objectives and criteria of the *European Heritage Label* to candidate sites and their support to the sites.

Special thanks go to the Estonian Presidency for organising the yearly *European Heritage Label* networking meeting where the *EHL sites* could meet colleagues from other sectors as well.

The Panel is very grateful to the European Commission for the excellent co-operation and support given to the Panel during and in between the meetings.

The Panel addresses its thanks to its former members who helped shape the process and are excellent ambassadors for the initiative.

The *European Heritage Label* has got to this stage thanks to all applicants since 2013, successful or otherwise: without them there would be no sites!

## Key figures 2013-2017

	Selection	Selection	Selection	Monitoring	Selection
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Eligible Member States	5	18	24	-	24
Member States participating	5	13	11	13	19
Sites to consider	9	36	18	20	25
Thematic national sites	1	1	0	1	0
Transnational sites	1	0	0	0	4
Intergovernmental labelled sites	-	29	1	11	4
Sites recommended for the EHL	4	16	9	-	9
Thematic national sites	0	1	0	-	0
Transnational sites	0	0	0	-	1
Intergovernmental labelled sites	-	11	0	-	1
Member States concerned	3	10	9	-	9

## Participating Member States

The following lists provide an overview of the participating Member States since 2013. Article 19 of Decision 1194/2011/EU establishing the European Heritage Label (EHL) provided some transitional measures and a few Member States have not yet indicated their willingness to participate in the European Heritage Label.

### 2013 Selection year: Member States that did not participate in the intergovernmental initiative

5 Member States confirmed their interest in the EHL and sent applications\*  
AUSTRIA\* - DENMARK\* - ESTONIA\* - LUXEMBURG\* - NETHERLANDS\*

### 2014 Selection year: Member States that participated in the intergovernmental initiative

18 EU Member States confirmed their interest in the EHL  
13 Member States\* sent applications  
BELGIUM\* - BULGARIA - CYPRUS\* - CZECH REPUBLIC\* - FRANCE\* - GERMANY\* - GREECE\* - HUNGARY\* - ITALY\* - LATVIA - LITHUANIA\* - MALTA - POLAND\* - PORTUGAL\* - ROMANIA - SLOVAKIA - SLOVENIA\* - SPAIN\*

### 2015 Selection year: all Member States

24 Member States confirmed their interest in the EHL  
11 Member States\* sent applications  
AUSTRIA\* - BELGIUM\* - BULGARIA - CROATIA\* - CYPRUS - CZECH REPUBLIC\* - DENMARK - ESTONIA\* - FRANCE\* - GERMANY - GREECE - HUNGARY\* - ITALY\* - LATVIA - LITHUANIA - LUXEMBOURG - MALTA - NETHERLANDS\* - POLAND\* - PORTUGAL\* - ROMANIA - SLOVAK REPUBLIC - SLOVENIA - SPAIN

### 2016 Monitoring year: Member States with EHL sites selected in 2013 and 2014

AUSTRIA - ESTONIA - FRANCE - GERMANY - GREECE - HUNGARY - ITALY - LITHUANIA - NETHERLANDS - POLAND - PORTUGAL - SLOVENIA - SPAIN

### 2017 Selection year: all Member States

24 Member States confirmed their interest in the EHL  
19 Member States\* sent applications  
AUSTRIA\* - BELGIUM\* - BULGARIA\* - CROATIA - CYPRUS - CZECH REPUBLIC\* - DENMARK - ESTONIA\* - FRANCE\* - GERMANY\* - GREECE\* - HUNGARY\* - ITALY\* - LATVIA\* - LITHUANIA - LUXEMBOURG\* - MALTA - NETHERLANDS\* - POLAND\* - PORTUGAL\* - ROMANIA\* - SLOVAK REPUBLIC\* - SLOVENIA\* - SPAIN

## Timeline of the labelled sites

Neanderthal Prehistoric Site and Krapina Museum, HUŠNJAKOVO/KRAPINA (CROATIA)	2015
Heart of Ancient Athens, ATHENS (GREECE)	2014
Archaeological Site of Carnuntum, PETRONELL-CARNUNTUM (AUSTRIA)	2013
Leipzig's Musical Heritage Sites, LEIPZIG (GERMANY)	2017
Abbey of Cluny, CLUNY (FRANCE)	2014
Olomouc Premyslid Castle and Archdiocesan Museum, OLOMOUC (CZECH REPUBLIC)	2015
Archive of the Crown of Aragon, BARCELONA (SPAIN)	2014
Great Guild Hall, TALLINN (ESTONIA)	2013
Sagres Promontory, SAGRES (PORTUGAL)	2015
General Library of the University of Coimbra, COIMBRA (PORTUGAL)	2014
Imperial Palace, VIENNA (AUSTRIA)	2015
Union of Lublin (1569), LUBLIN (POLAND)	2014
Sites of the Peace of Westphalia (1648), MÜNSTER AND OSNABRÜCK (GERMANY)	2014
3 May 1791 Constitution, WARSAW (POLAND)	2014
Historic Ensemble of the University of Tartu, TARTU (ESTONIA)	2015
Hambach Castle, HAMBACH (GERMANY)	2014
Dohány Street Synagogue Complex, BUDAPEST (HUNGARY)	2017
Fort Cadine, TRENTO (ITALY)	2017
Charter of Law for the Abolition of the Death Penalty (1867), LISBON (PORTUGAL)	2014
Franz Liszt Academy of Music, BUDAPEST (HUNGARY)	2015
Mundaneum, MONS (BELGIUM)	2015
Peace Palace, THE HAGUE (NETHERLANDS)	2013
Javorca Memorial Church and its cultural landscape, TOLMIN (SLOVENIA)	2017
Student Residence or ' <i>Residencia de Estudiantes</i> ', MADRID (SPAIN)	2014
World War I Eastern Front Cemetery No. 123, ŁUŻNA – PUSTKI, (POLAND)	2015
Kaunas of 1919-1940, KAUNAS (LITHUANIA)	2014
Camp Westerbork, HOOGHALEN (NETHERLANDS)	2013
Former Natzweiler concentration camp and its satellite camps (FRANCE-GERMANY)	2017
Franja Partisan Hospital, CERKNO (SLOVENIA)	2014
Sighet Memorial, SIGHET (ROMANIA)	2017
European District of Strasbourg, STRASBOURG (FRANCE)	2015
Robert Schuman's House, SCY-CHAZELLES (FRANCE)	2014
Bois du Cazier, MARCINELLE (BELGIUM)	2017
Alcide de Gasperi's House Museum, PIEVE TESINO (ITALY)	2014
Historic Gdańsk Shipyard, GDANSK (POLAND)	2014

Village of Schengen, SCHENGEN (LUXEMBOURG)	2017
Pan-European Picnic Memorial Park, SOPRON (HUNGARY)	2014
Maastricht Treaty, MAASTRICHT (NETHERLANDS)	2017

## Labelled sites per selection year

- 2013 Archaeological Site of Carnuntum, PETRONELL-CARNUNTUM (AUSTRIA)  
Great Guild Hall, TALLINN (ESTONIA)  
Peace Palace, THE HAGUE (NETHERLANDS)  
Camp Westerbork, HOOGHALEN (NETHERLANDS)
- 2014 Heart of Ancient Athens, ATHENS (GREECE)  
Abbey of Cluny, CLUNY (FRANCE)  
Archive of the Crown of Aragon, BARCELONA (SPAIN)  
Union of Lublin (1569), LUBLIN (POLAND)  
Sites of the Peace of Westphalia (1648), MÜNSTER AND OSNABRÜCK (GERMANY)  
General Library of the University of Coimbra, COIMBRA (PORTUGAL)  
3 May 1791 Constitution, WARSAW (POLAND)  
Hambach Castle, HAMBACH (GERMANY)  
Charter of Law for the Abolition of the Death Penalty (1867), LISBON (PORTUGAL)  
Student Residence or '*Residencia de Estudiantes*', MADRID (SPAIN)  
Kaunas of 1919-1940, KAUNAS (LITHUANIA)  
Franja Partisan Hospital, CERKNO (SLOVENIA)  
Robert Schuman's House, SCY-CHAZELLES (FRANCE)  
Alcide de Gasperi's House Museum, PIEVE TESINO (ITALY)  
Historic Gdańsk Shipyard, GDANSK (POLAND)  
Pan-European Picnic Memorial Park, SOPRON (HUNGARY)
- 2015 Neanderthal Prehistoric Site and Krapina Museum, HUŠNJAKOVO/KRAPINA (CROATIA)  
Olomouc Premyslid Castle and Archdiocesan Museum, OLOMOUC (CZECH REPUBLIC)  
Sagres Promontory, SAGRES (PORTUGAL)  
Imperial Palace, VIENNA (AUSTRIA)  
Historic Ensemble of the University of Tartu, TARTU (ESTONIA)  
Franz Liszt Academy of Music, BUDAPEST (HUNGARY)  
Mundaneum, MONS (BELGIUM)  
World War I Eastern Front Cemetery No. 123, ŁUŻNA – PUSTKI (POLAND)  
European District of Strasbourg, STRASBOURG (FRANCE)

2017 Leipzig's Musical Heritage Sites, LEIPZIG (GERMANY)

Dohány Street Synagogue Complex, BUDAPEST (HUNGARY)

Fort Cadine, TRENTO (ITALY)

Javorca Memorial Church and its cultural landscape, TOLMIN (SLOVENIA)

Former Natzweiler concentration camp and its satellite camps (FRANCE-GERMANY)

Sighet Memorial, SIGHET(ROMANIA)

Bois du Cazier, MARCINELLE (BELGIUM)

Village of Schengen, SCHENGEN (LUXEMBOURG)

Maastricht Treaty, MAASTRICHT (NETHERLANDS)

## Labelled sites per selection year, per Member State

2013	AUSTRIA	Archaeological Site of Carnuntum, PETRONELL-CARNUNTUM
	ESTONIA	Great Guild Hall, TALLINN
	NETHERLANDS	Peace Palace, THE HAGUE Camp Westerbork, HOOGHALEN
2014	FRANCE	Abbey of Cluny, CLUNY Robert Schuman's House, SCY-CHAZELLES
	GERMANY	Sites of the Peace of Westphalia (1648), MÜNSTER AND OSNABRÜCK Hambach Castle, HAMBACH
	GREECE	Heart of Ancient Athens, ATHENS
	HUNGARY	Pan-European Picnic Memorial Park, SOPRON
	ITALY	Alcide de Gasperi's House Museum, PIEVE TESINO
	LITHUANIA	Kaunas of 1919-1940, KAUNAS
	POLAND	Union of Lublin (1569), LUBLIN 3 May 1791 Constitution, WARSAW Historic Gdańsk Shipyard, GDANSK
	PORTUGAL	General Library of the University of Coimbra, COIMBRA Charter of Law for the Abolition of the Death Penalty (1867), LISBON
	SLOVENIA	Franja Partisan Hospital, CERKNO
	SPAIN	Archive of the Crown of Aragon, BARCELONA Student Residence or ' <i>Residencia de Estudiantes</i> ', MADRID
	2015	AUSTRIA
BELGIUM		Mundaneum, MONS
CROATIA		Neanderthal Prehistoric Site and Krapina Museum, HUŠNJAKOVO/KRAPINA
CZECH REPUBLIC		Olomouc Premyslid Castle and Archdiocesan Museum, OLOMOUC
ESTONIA		Historic Ensemble of the University of Tartu, TARTU
FRANCE		European District of Strasbourg, STRASBOURG
HUNGARY		Franz Liszt Academy of Music, BUDAPEST
POLAND		World War I Eastern Front Wartime Cemetery No. 123, ŁUŻNA – PUSTKI
PORTUGAL		Sagres Promontory, SAGRES
2017	BELGIUM	Bois du Cazier, MARCINELLE
	FRANCE	Former Natzweiler concentration camp and its satellite camps (with GERMANY)
	GERMANY	Leipzig's Musical Heritage Sites, LEIPZIG Former Natzweiler concentration camp and its satellite camps (with FRANCE)
	HUNGARY	Dohány Street Synagogue Complex, BUDAPEST
	ITALY	Fort Cadine, TRENTO

LUXEMBOURG	Village of Schengen, SCHENGEN
NETHERLANDS	Maastricht Treaty, MAASTRICHT
ROMANIA	The Sighet Memorial, SIGHET
SLOVENIA	Javorca Memorial Church and its cultural landscape, TOLMIN

## Labelled sites per Member State

AUSTRIA	Archaeological Site of Carnuntum, PETRONELL-CARNUNTUM	2013
	Imperial Palace, VIENNA	2015
BELGIUM	Mundaneum, MONS	2015
	Bois du Cazier, MARCINELLE	2017
CROATIA	Neanderthal Prehistoric Site and Krapina Museum, HUŠNJAKOVO/KRAPINA	2015
CZECH REPUBLIC	Olomouc Premyslid Castle and Archdiocesan Museum, OLOMOUC	2015
ESTONIA	Great Guild Hall, TALLINN	2013
	Historic Ensemble of the University of Tartu, TARTU	2015
FRANCE	Abbey of Cluny, CLUNY	2014
	Robert Schuman's House, SCY-CHAZELLES	2014
	European District of Strasbourg, STRASBOURG	2015
	Former Natzweiler concentration camp and its satellite camps (with GERMANY)	2017
GERMANY	Sites of the Peace of Westphalia (1648), MÜNSTER AND OSNABRÜCK	2014
	Hambach Castle, HAMBACH	2014
	Leipzig's Musical Heritage Sites, LEIPZIG	2017
	Former Natzweiler concentration camp and its satellite camps (with FRANCE)	2017
GREECE	Heart of Ancient Athens, ATHENS	2014
HUNGARY	Pan-European Picnic Memorial Park, SOPRON	2014
	Franz Liszt Academy of Music, BUDAPEST	2015
	Dohány Street Synagogue Complex, BUDAPEST	2017
ITALY	Alcide de Gasperi's House Museum, PIEVE TESINO	2014
	Fort Cadine, TRENTO	2017
LITHUANIA	Kaunas of 1919-1940, KAUNAS	2014
LUXEMBURG	Village of Schengen, SCHENGEN	2017
NETHERLANDS	Peace Palace, THE HAGUE	2013
	Camp Westerbork, HOOGHALEN	2013
	Maastricht Treaty, MAASTRICHT	2017
POLAND	Union of Lublin (1569), LUBLIN	2014
	3 May 1791 Constitution, WARSAW	2014
	Historic Gdańsk Shipyard, GDANSK	2014
	World War I Eastern Front Wartime Cemetery No. 123, ŁUŻNA – PUSTKI	2015
PORTUGAL	General Library of the University of Coimbra, COIMBRA	2014
	Charter of Law for the Abolition of the Death Penalty, LISBON	2014
	Sagres Promontory, SAGRES	2015
ROMANIA	Sighet Memorial, SIGHET	2017
SLOVENIA	Franja Partisan Hospital, CERKNO	2014
	Javorca Memorial Church and its cultural landscape, TOLMIN	2017
SPAIN	Archive of the Crown of Aragon, BARCELONA	2014
	Student Residence or ' <i>Residencia de Estudiantes</i> ', MADRID	2014

## Members of the 2017 European Heritage Label Panel

Ms Bénédicte Selfslagh, Chairperson

Ms Beatrice Kelly, Editor/Rapporteur

Mr Roland Bernecker, acting Chairperson

Ms Pia Leydolt-Fuchs

Mr Christer Gustafsson

Ms Csilla Hegedus

Ms Teti Stamatia Hadjinicolaou

Ms Françoise Lempereur

Ms Martine Pastor

Mr Michele Rak

Mr Matthias Ripp

Mr Gábor Sonkoly

Mr Joseph Stulc

## Information & contact

European Commission  
Directorate General Education and Culture

Web address

[https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/european-heritage-label\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/european-heritage-label_en)

E-mail

[Eac-Culture@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Eac-Culture@ec.europa.eu)