

OUTPUT 3.2.2



Expert workshop Mapping of core and buffer zones

Sonja Jilek

Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung

sonja.jilek@aon.at



**CENTRAL
EUROPE**
COOPERATING FOR SUCCESS



EUROPEAN UNION
EUROPEAN REGIONAL
DEVELOPMENT FUND



1CE079P4 / Danube Limes - UNESCO World Heritage Project

"This project is implemented within the CENTRAL EUROPE Programme co-financed by the ERDF"

AGENDA

Tuesday, 6th April 2010

11.15 Reports on the archaeological definition and mapping of core and buffer zones. Detailed presentation of selected sites and methods of definition and mapping. Description of boundaries of forts, adjacent civil settlements, watchtowers. Discussion of Limes road. Discussion of work done and work in progress. Discussion of timetable for archaeological records and data bases according to the nomination process.

Ripa Pannonica in Hungary (Zsolt Visy, Maté Szabó)

14.00 The Danube Limes in Slovakia (Lubica Pincikova)

14.45 The Danube Limes in Austria (Andreas Schwarcz, Sonja Jilek, Eva Kuttner)

15.15 Discussion of core and buffer zones for the prospective World Heritage

Discussion on the harmonization of aspirations between HU and SK nominations

17.00 Travel to Zeiselmauer (15 minutes by bus), visite of Zeiselmauer Roman remains

Wednesday, 7th April 2010

9.00 Danubelimes Project: discussion of budget changes (Anton Schabl)

10.30 The Danube Limes project website (Ágnes Bechtold)

The Danube Limes communication plan (Sonja Jilek)

11.00 Meeting of the Project's Steering Committee, all others

11.00 Visit to Tulln Römermuseum and the Roman remains in Tulln (guide Eva Kuttner)

13.45 Internal evaluation of the 1st project phase (Project period 1 to 3)

Core outputs, project outputs, goals achieved, future work and discussion of timetable

Discussion on arrangements for protection and management of the future WHS in HU, SK and A, draft management plans

Discussion of attributes for national SOUV in HU, SK and AT

MINUTES

Participants:

LP: Tamás Fejérdy (T.F.), Judit Saád (J.S.), Ágnes Bechtold (A.B.), Dénes Jankovich-Bésán (D.J.), Zsolt Maté (Zs.M.), Gábor Varga (G.V.)

PP 2: Lubica Pincikova (L.P.), Anna Tuharska (A.T.)

PP 3: Sonja Jilek (S.J.), Andreas Schwarcz (A.Sch.), Anton Schabl (A.S.), Eva Kuttner (E.K.)

PP 4: excused

PP 5: excused

PP 6: Zsolt Visy (ZS.V.), Robert Lóki (R.L.), Maté Szabó (M.SZ.), Annamária Priskin (A.P.), Andreas Gyulasi (A.GY.)

Programme Tuesday, 6th April 2010

A.Sch. welcomed the participants. S.J. announced details and small changes in the organisation of the workshop.

1. Reports on the archaeological definition and mapping of core and buffer zones. Detailed presentation of selected sites and methods of definition and mapping. Description of boundaries of forts, adjacent civil settlements, watchtowers. Discussion of Limes road. Discussion of work done and work in progress. Discussion of timetable for archaeological records and data bases according to the nomination process.

1a. Ripa Pannonica in Hungary

The work on the Ripa Pannonica in Hungary was presented by Zsolt Visy with the assistance of Maté Szabó. The archaeological base-work of a sector of the Hungarian Limes is quite ready in the county of Pést. More work needs to be done in the southern part, south of Budapest but this work is in progress. Work is based on geophysical surveys, aerial photography and existing databases. Zs.V. showed examples of sites with proposals for core and buffer zones with the help of Google map pictures.

The full frontier system includes 415 km of Limes road and military posts on the right as well as on the left side of the Danube. All features will be included according to the Koblenz Declaration of the Bratislava Group, which was accepted by UNESCO together with the ORL nomination in 2005. The system was in use from 1st century to the beginning of 5th century AD. Justification of the SOUV of the Hungarian stretch: Criteria II, III and IV according to the Tentative List of the ripa Pannonica handed in to the UNESCO Commission in June 2009.

Some of the few reconstruction will be put in the buffer zone. Limes road sometimes runs away from the river line, sometimes 2 rows of towers, along the river and along the military road.

Albertfalva: auxiliary fort, not covered

Aquincum, military amphitheatre, conserved; Aquincum legionary fortress, overbuilt; Aquincum governors palace, partly overbuilt; Aquincum, early fort, covered; Aquincum, municipium, only partly covered, core zone/protected area will be the archaeological park, all around buffer zone, also aquaeduct; canabae legionis, several important places, should be incorporated in the nomination, also towers identified; Late Roman fortress, partly excavated, partly covered, „Contra Aquincum“; Trans-Aquincum, partly covered, structure was not totally excavated in old times, structure is not quite clear, maybe damaged by later construction (comment T.F.: all the sites are not agreed yet, this certainly needs more discussion).

South of Campona, Roman road proved, Roman tower/post

Campona fort, not covered, some parts are visible and reconstructed, new excavations, parts of the vicus could be possible to protect as core zone

Leányfalu, conserved watchtower, uncovered, visible, under protection

Cirpi No. 1, north of Budapest, watchtower Dunabogdány identified, not visible, not covered, place with some wells, disturbed? by wells

Cirpi No. 3, burgus fortification, not a small watchtower, north of Szentendre, private garden/territory, owner used Roman stones in his buildings, can we nominate it? possibly not

Cirpi No. 4+5, watchtowers, not covered, little and big Danube, also tower on left hand side of Danube

Cirpi No. 6, watchtower, beside the Danube, not covered

Cirpi fort, Dunabogdány, in the Danube bend, free, not covered at all, also vicus is known, only one excavation in middle of 50er , Kleinkastell in der North-east corner (end of 4th century)

Felsőgöd, not covered, oval shape, late Roman fort, aerial photography located, 374-388 n. Chr. very short lifetime, little excavation, only ditches were dug, not finished, left side of the Danube, 6 km away from the Danube!! Somehow connected with the Great plain system

Solva No. 1-29, watchtowers between Solva and Visegrád, identified, mostly not built over

Szentendre fort, archaeological zone, not built over, but a plan of the town to create a hotel

Visegrád Gizellatelep, fortlet of the times of Valentinian, west of Visegrád, excavated, not built over, conservation work, main road cuts a bit in the fortification, 90% is free and under conservation process

Visegrád Sibrik domb, late Roman fortification, triangle, not built over, conserved

Roman Limes road, many kilometers are known, on the bases of old military maps, many parts are free of any buildings, sometimes towers are identified along the road, connecting line between fortifications, without identification it is impossible,

S.J. Some parts of this road system should be preserved and protected, also line of watchtower along the Danube

General discussion:

T.F. and Zs.M. state that sites, visible or un-visible, have to be proved at least in 2 ways, it is not enough to argue with finds (coins, pottery). It is necessary that structures are identified by aerial archaeology, geophysics and/or excavation. This especially goes for the nomination of the watchtowers and the Limes road. Zs. M.:we need to identify longer sectors which show the system, but the question remains: how can we protect it, how can we manage it?

1b. The Danube Limes in Slovakia

The work was presented by Lubica Pincipkova with the assistance of Anna Tuharska. The work on the Slovakian Limes concentrated on 2 sites, Rusovce/Gerulata and Iža/Kelemantia/Komarno. Iža lays on the left bank of river Danube. PUSR produced maps which show the exact location of sites. The properties were identified, archive work down and a summary of all material from archive of Monuments Boards and other sources Was brought together for the mapping of the actual state on both sites. The documentation of the sites have been prepared, orto-photo maps obtained of the whole border 70 km in Slovakia

Gerulata fort, small excavated part, mostly built over; The core zone, which lies inside the village of Rusovce will be the fort, buffer zone will be inside the declared protected zone. Gerulata is already protected as a national cultural monument. The historical houses of Rusovce are also a historic zone, which will be of help to protect the archaeological remains too. This is so far the only one zone with archaeological monuments in Slovakia and is protected by law.

Iža fort, not overbuilt, inside the cadastre maps. Iža fort will built up the core zone. It is the bridgehead fort for the legionary fortress of Brigetio in Hungary. A presentation project is already planned by the Slovakian Ministry of Culture together with the museum in Komárno. it is already protected as a national cultural monument. There is a wide buffer zone planned, because of agricultural land around.

The history and development of sites will be done by J. Schmidtova (Rusovce: City Museum of Bratislava) and J. Rajtár (Iža: Slovakian Academy o Sciences). Graphic and digital

visualisations in Gerulata are finished, in Iža this work is in progress. The Management Plan plan is prepared by member of PUSR. Meetings with stakeholders resulting in an agreement on the representatives responsible for site management plan.

On an international level PUSR proposes a Danube Limes Management Group including Slovakia, Hungary, Austria. On a national level there will be an inter-department commission including the Ministries of Culture, Economy, Regionals, Education and also the national research institutions (SAV, region of Nitra, museum Komárno, City of Bratislava Museum) and the Monuments Boards of SK. On a local level for example in Iža, there will be a group of representatives (owners, self-governing region of Nitra (Danubian Museum), the municipality of Iža) who will look after the day-to-day management of the site. A similar arrangement is discussed for Rusovce/Gerulata.

PUSR intends to establish a monitoring system, established 2-year monitoring cyclus (works quite well for other sites in Slovakia). One year it is focussed on the area, the 2nd year focussed on the objects of monuments. Key indicators need to be specified and also responsibilities.

The next steps include the finalisation of management plan, other activities according to plan, stakeholder meetings, publishing of project results on website and organisation of expert workshop Banska Stiavnica from 12.-14. October 2010. More work needs to be done on the management and monitoring system, the coordination of nomination strategy between SK and HU and the building of an information system.

1c. The Danube Limes in Austria

The work was presented by Andreas Schwarcz, Sonja Jilek and Eva Kuttner.

A.Sch. stated that the Austrian Ministry of Education, responsible for the WH nominations in Austria has recently established a working group which includes the responsible part of the Ministry itself, the Austrian Monument preservation authority, the archaeological research represented by IÖG and an external GIS office (Schabl & Partner). One of the first tasks is the review of the draft of the Austrian Tentative List Entry, which was prepared inside the project by IÖG. Together the working group already identified 20 possible sites for nomination. In Austria there are 3 governments involved: Upper Austria, Lower Austria, Vienna. The next steps will be regular meetings of this working group (every 2-3 weeks) to establish a final list of sites and discuss the individual core and buffer zones.

S. J. presented an overview on the Austrian Limes section, which is about 350 km long, with 57 sites in total. There are 4 legionary fortresses, 16 forts and several watchtowers. Not all can be listed because some are destroyed already. Only a few sites, 4 of the 20 selected ones are not built over. Also the Austrian selection and identification of sites will follow the

guidelines by the Koblenz Declaration. IÖG already has a good database on the whole Austrian Limes, which is enlarged by necessary additional information. The most prominent features of the Austrian section are the high standing Roman military monuments, which are in a unique state of preservation. The SOUV should be built on these elements. A general map was prepared but individual sites maps need to be done.

E.K. presented a case study of the Linz area (identification of fort and vicus), which was prepared during the project period 2 and 3. In Linz the location of fort is not clear, the archaeological area covers 300.000m². In the moment there is no overall map of all the findspots, and not everything activities done in the last 100 years is published. The starting point was to look into a detailed area to see how much archaeology has survived under the houses of the city of Linz. In the investigated area this was nearly 70%, the rest is destroyed by cellars, infrastructure work e.g.

1d. General discussion of core and buffer zones for the prospective World Heritage

S.J. says that it seems that all 3 countries are in agreement when it comes to nominate the main military fortifications (Legionary fortresses, forts, fortlets) as core zones of the prospective World Heritage. It seems to be more complicated how to deal with the vici, the civil settlements around the fortifications, the cemeteries and of course the Limes road. T.F. states that the nomination process is a difficult task, where the biggest and crucial issue is the management issue. Beside the identification of sites or segments/sectors, it is necessary to consider the ICOMOS method for evaluation. ICOMOS sees the authenticity and integrity of the sites as the most important issues. We could/should have the largest possible number of sites nominated, but it also needs a strong system of selection with special criterias. Zs.M. says that he has studied the ORL nomination document; they do not include Roman villas and natural sites. T. F. asks how dense must the system be, when we select sites ? Is it necessary to identify a minimum distance in order to keep the continuity of the system, functional meaning? Zs.V. argues that the Limes road is the connecting element, the line of communication; therefore it is necessary to include parts of the Limes road.

Criteria for selection: Zs.V. says that of course the different sections of the frontier in AT, K and HU have their own characteristics, but at the same time have its own characteristics of history, military system, climate. He would opt to include as much sites as possible under the scope of authenticity and integrity. It should be possible to nominate as long sections as possible. We need to consider too that our nomination will be an example for other river Limes nominations. We should keep in mind thinking of the following nominations. A.Sch. argues that legionary fortresses, auxiliary forts, watchtowers should be included. Civil settlements and cemeteries should be included as much as possible as well as bridgehead

forts. T. F. raised the question how to demonstrate the Roman fort under modern settlements. To which level is this needed? Zs.V. says that an adequate tool is needed, we should nominate:

1. Everything which is visible or excavated (except those parts which are destroyed after excavations).
2. Everything which is proved by archaeological research, field work and identifying places
3. Everything which is proved by aerial investigations and geophysical measurements

L.P. argues that in a case in SK ICOMOS has not accepted the identification of a site by geophysical survey. T.F. reminds on the discussion in the morning, where it was stated that at least 2 tools are needed to include a site in the nomination list. All participants agreed to the following criteria for the definition and the inclusion of

The Core Zone: we should be able to demonstrate for each site:

- Historic importance
- Historic evidence
- Historic contextual
- Legal protection
- Management
- We need to have at least 2 different tools seeing the same result before a site structure is included in the nomination list

Buffer Zone:

- Protection physical
- Protection visuel
- Protection contextual
- Legal protection

S.J. says that size of maps (overall as well as detailed maps) as well as the use of archaeological terms should be consistent inside the Danube Limes applications and with the most recent application of the Antoine Wall accepted by UNESCO. L.P. size of maps need to be discussed and harmonized. S.J. reminds and will send round information on the “thesaurus” which was produced during an older EU project, which lists quite a lot of relevant archaeological terms in different languages.

Timetable: to have a reasonable timeframe for the writing of the nomination documents, the final mapping of core and buffer zones of sites and especially details of the Management Plan it is absolutely necessary to present a final stage of the archaeological background before April 2011.

Programme Wednesday, 7th April 2010

2. Discussion of project budget reallocation

A.S. presented a draft of the changed budget, where he has included all the changes, which the partners identified and discussed with him during the last 2-3 months. He reminds all partners that the budget flexibility up to 10% per WP and PP is no problem, but this should not exceed 10%, otherwise a decision by the management authority is necessary, which comes close to a new application. As far as he can see there are no mayor challenges to be faced after the complications with PP 2 were solved in the Budapest meeting with the LP on 30.04.2010. There is still not all the money spent which were foreseen in the project periods 1 to 3 but most of the differences are due to the very late start of the project (contract). A. S. will now contact the JTS about the changed budget and report back to partners. He will also ask JTS when the first project money will come back from JTS.

A.S. and J.S. reminded all partners that the 3rd report will have to be handed in June. Than it takes 1-2 month to prove and 3-4 weeks later the project money should be handed out to the LP. In case of further questions the national contact points should be contacted. The next project co-ordination meeting is planned for the 2nd half of June 2010 in KÖH in Budapest.

3. The Danube Limes project website

There was the question raised by KÖH if the Danube Limes Project website could also be enlarged and host more specific information about the individual Limes sections. J.S. says that maybe the project website could be used for different purposes, do we want to include the scientific database or more scientific content? S.J. says that it seems to be important how much maintainance structure and finances are to be expected after the end of the project. Zs.V. reports that there are more possibilities to present a wider level and scientific content. The scientific website for ripa Pannonica is not finished yet, but should be completed; in a couple of months it will be ready. T.F. mentions that KÖH website could be an umbrella to other websites, for example it can link to Zsolt Biro, who has his own scientific website for KÖH. It was decided that the project website should serve mainly for project purposes and as a hub to other relevant websites. To better serve general project administration it was agreed that more individual project reports will be set up under the internal level to increase and improve the communication level between the PP.

4. The Danube Limes communication plan

S.J. states that for the 3rd project report she will need information by each partner on the media lists and communication activities in general. J.S. will send all the press activities so far handed in by partners to her too. At the end of the 3rd project period also an update of the

general communication plan is planned. Information should be sent till the end of April 2010 to S.J.

Zs.V. announced that he is organising a session on aerial photography at the annual EAA meeting in Den Haag/NL 1.-5. September 2010. Lectures, posters and other inputs are welcome. Deadline for abstracts is 1st May 2010. Maybe the projects objectives, aims and meantime goals can be presented by a poster. This will be discussed with the Polish partner PP5. See also www.eaa.2010.nl

L.P. announced that there is a meeting on management of WH sites, especially discussing authenticity and integrity aspects, in Sweden in December 2010. She will send round information by mail.

S.J. said that she proposed a paper/lecture at the WH Tourism Conference, which takes place in Quebec/Canada and was accepted by the organisation committee. She will hand in the information to J.S. to forward it to JTS for consideration.

5. Steering Committee Meeting (see separate minute and list of participants)

6. Internal evaluation of the 1st project phase (Project period 1 to 3)

Short review of core outputs and project outputs, goals achieved and future work. T.F. expressed his wish for a timetable of actions and dates.

Reports on Core outputs presented after the end of the 3rd project period

- Definition, description and mapping of Limes samples (HU, SK, A)
- DLK management plan

Reports on normal project outputs after the end of the 3rd project period

- Update of the Communication plan
- Media list of all partners
- Draft of the Hungarian management plan
- Draft of the Slovakian management plan
- Report on opinion forming process/public activities in Austria

All reports need to have a clear structure, examples of the work done and maps where necessary. If the main report is in the national language a short summary in English is necessary. They should be handed in to KÖH by the **end of April 2010**

The next coordination workshop for all PP is planned for the **second half of June** in Budapest. J.S. will contact all partners for the exact date.

The next international expert workshop is planned for **17-19 November 2010**. It will be held in Vienna and Bratislava. Members of the projects external experts have already been contacted to fix the date. It will start on Tuesday evening in Vienna including parts of the

Computer Heritage Conference organised by the Wiener Stadtarchäologie and will continue in Bratislava, where the Slovakian partner will host the meeting.

Outputs	April 2010	May 2010	June 2010
3 rd project report	Individual PP reports of 3 rd project period send to KÖH	Summary by KÖH, A. Schabl, S. Jilek	PP reports of 3 rd project period send to JTS
Update Communication Plan	Details of the national plans send to S.J. before the end of April	Update of Comm. Plan	Will be handed in together with the 3 rd project report
Media Lists	Details of national Media Lists send to S.J. before the end of April		
General Reports	Reports on Core Outputs (project period 1-3) send to KÖH till the end of April		Will be handed in together with the 3 rd project report
General reports	Reports on Project outputs (project period 1-3) send to KÖH till the end of April		Will be handed in together with the 3 rd project report
Report on Project budget reallocation	Discussed by A. Schabl with JTS	Report back to the Steering Committee and all PP	
Workshops			Partner Co-operation workshop in the 2 nd half of June in Budapest

7. Discussion on arrangements for protection and management of the future WHS in HU, SK and A, draft management plans

L.P. explains that SK will base its management system on already existing structures, this includes a management group on each sites, and ready proposals for indicators. In her

opinion the management system greatly depends on the legal system of the state party. It needs a unified management plan for both parts (HU and SK), but it works quite differently on both countries. Also research is quite different. There is a certain hierarchy of management as a serial nomination. In SK they plan to have the two sites which are managed separately, a national management system, which acts under an overarching system in the Danube Limes countries.

Zs.M. has studied the German management plan. In his opinion we need a more detailed plan. He mentions as an example the WH Neusiedlersee. The joint management plan includes exact programmes and strategies (not in the overarching DLK management plan). There also regional plans and local plans. In Hungarian legislation there is not a special law for WH sites, it is necessary to define other ways of long-term management and protection. It needs to be said that the management plan in Hungary has no legal state! It works with self-restrictions

it can be inserted as culturally important zone, but the other planning levels are independent. It is possible to get all organised management bodies together, all the mayors sign that they will not do anything against the site. But if something changes in this system, a new mayor for example, who do not agree, matters get complicate. T.F says that maybe we are not able to accept all the structure and we will not need managers for the individual sites, maybe we will arrange something for certain stretches. It is quite clear that we need two central centers, one on the south stretch (in Paks?), one in the middle of the north stretch (in Brigetio ?) There are also some questions about the Monitoring system discussed and solved during the next project months. Zs.M. says that a database with categories of typical features needs to be set up for the management, which includes legal approach, practical approach and site approach. Zs. V. says that it is necessary to create a management system and a management centre with financial support with state approval

8. Discussion of attributes for national SOUV in HU, SK and AT

S.J. reports that at the Xanten meeting in March it was decided that the new overarching SOUV (Statement of Outstanding Universal Value), which UNESCO wants to have for the "FRE – WHS" will be prepared by the already inscribed partners from UK and Germany. This does not effect HU, SK and AT but need to be done till 2013 at the latest.

Zs.V. reminds about the detailed evaluation by ICOMOS. Within this document it is emphasised that all newer nominations have to have their own argumentations for attributes, kind of consistency. Also criteria for nomination must be the same. J.F. says that it is not necessary to invent new arguments. Zs.M.: AW –WHS has an earthwall, HW – WHS a stonewall, the ORL consists most of a palisade/stone wall, whereas the Danube Limes is a river frontier. The overarching characteristics of the Danube river frontiers are:

- the natural barrier
- chain of fortifications, connected by the Limes road
- fortifications on either side of the river
- the afterlife

L.P. reminds that a comparison with other WHS and other parts of the Roman frontiers also needs to be prepared for the individual new nominations.

16.00 End of meeting