

The Great Spas of Europe

Mayors Steering Group meeting MSG 22.

09:30 Wednesday 4th and Thursday 5th September 2019.

L'Hôtel de Ville. Vichy. France.

Those present:

Mayors and political representatives	Representing	Group	Observers	Representing	Group
1.Yves-Jean Bignon Chair for the meeting	Vichy	MSG	14.Frédéric Aguilera 15.Bernard Kajdan 16.Pierre Dervieux 17.Anke Matthys	Mayor of Vichy Deputy Mayor of Vichy	SMG
2.Stefan Szirucsek	Baden bei Wien	MSG	18.Hans Hornyik 19.Klaus Lorenz	Baden bei Wien	SMG Msubg
3.Sophie Delettre	Spa	MSG Chair	20.Anne Pirard	Spa	SMG
4.Vojtěch Franta	Františkovy Lázně	MSG SMG			
5.Martin Kalina	Mariánské Lázně	MSG	21.Vladimir Kajlik	Mariánské Lázně	SMG
6.Andrea Pfeffer-Ferklová	Karlovy Vary	MSG	22.Lucie Sochorková	Karlovy Vary	SMG
7.Oliver Keügel	Bad Ems	MSG	23.Hans-Jürgen Sarholz	Bad Ems	SMG
8.Thomas Schwarz	Baden-Baden	MSG	24.Lisa Poetschki	Baden-Baden	SMG
9.Kay Blankenburg	Bad Kissingen	MSG	25.Peter Weidisch. 26.Anna-Maria Boll	Bad Kissingen	SMG SMG
10.Francesca Greco 11.Beatrice Chelli	Montecatini Terme	MSG	27.Rafaela Verdicchio	Montecatini Terme	SMG
12.Sue Craig	Bath	MSG	28.Tony Crouch	Bath	SMG
			29.Chris Pound	UK & Bath	IWG
13.Paul Simons	Secretary General	SG	30. Barry Gamble	Special Adviser	

Attachments:

Annex 1. Final version (13) of the Evaluation Mission programme.

Annex 2. Powerpoint presentation from Klaus Lorenz concerning the GSE Tourism & Marketing Strategy.

Annex 3. Notes from separate SMG meeting with Barry Gamble.

Annex 4. Revised 2019 budget.

Annex 5. Draft 2020 budget.

Annex 6. A summary of the decisions and resolutions made at MSG 22.

Minutes:

1. A warm welcome from the Mayor of Vichy, Frédéric Aguilera was presented to all delegates at this important period for the GSE nomination and he was sure the it would be a positive and productive meeting.
2. An introduction to the MSG representatives of the GSE member spa towns and the Site Managers present: the SG noted that Lord Mayor Margret Mergen was not able to attend the meeting due to a serious motorcycle accident and would not be returning to duties until her husband was well enough to leave hospital. The meeting agreed to send Margret and her husband their warmest greetings and best wishes. It was agreed that Yves-Jean Bignon as MSG representative of the host city of Vichy would chair the meeting. Thomas Schwarz was representing Margret Mergen, Oliver Krügel is the new Mayor of Bad Ems, Vice-Mayor Francesca Greco is representing Mayor Luca Baroncini the new Mayor of Montecatini Terme and Councillor Sue Craig is the new representative of the City of Bath. All were welcomed by the members of the MSG.
3. Any apologies received: from Margret Mergen (BB), Jan Kuchar (FL) and Luca Baroncini (MT). Vojtech Franta was deputising for Jan Kuchar.
4. The GSE Evaluation Mission:
 - 4.1 A summary of results from the Trail Evaluation: the SG introduced the results and observations following the trial evaluation mission undertaken by BG and the SG in May/June. All spa towns had received the report and individual comments and advice. In general, they had been surprised that some towns remained ill prepared for their visit and that he hoped that matters had progressed significantly since then. Both had also been surprised as to the extent of current and proposed new development in the spa towns and predicted that this could well become an issue during the forthcoming EM. Notes on all development proposals had already been forwarded to ICOMOS so it would be likely that the Experts will focus on these. Whilst accepting the dynamism of living cities and the 'Historic Urban Landscape' initiative approved by UNESCO and ICOMOS, developments that could potentially harm OUV were to be avoided at all cost and beneficial developments that enhance OUV should be seen in a positive light. The focus of the spa town visits is to demonstrate the substantial contribution that each component spa towns makes to the series. Other issues that the Experts would be concentrating on include: a detailed review of the boundaries, integrity and authenticity, the overall state of conservation and the protection and management measures in place. BG added that development is compatible with OUV as long as it did not harm OUV.

CP raised the matter of the ICOMOS gap report and BG responded that whilst none of the objectives had been achieved the GSE did constitute an unrepresented phenomenon

and that he believed that the GSE had demonstrated through its OUV that it clearly filled a gap in the WHList.

4.2 Detailed schedule; programme, timings logistics and those attending: A brief introduction of who is present and their roles (job title): a review of the issues to be discussed in the opening presentation had been circulated and is attached again below:

- Brief contextual information concerning the concept of the GSE but **NOT** a general history of the town.
- Concise summary of the component site – the nominated property.
- The boundaries – justification of the boundaries selected, this appears in the ND.
- Special contribution of the individual spa town to the OUV of the nominated property – remember that it is not a competition.
- General statement concerning integrity and authenticity – refer to the ND.
- General statement concerning overall state of conservation – refer to the ND.
- A brief summary of the protection and management in place, locally, regionally and nationally – refer to the ND.
- Any particular development issues – show on the map only the ones you submitted reports on.
- The routes to be taken during the visits and the elements that will be seen – a quick run through the route and sequence of evidence of the attributes to be viewed.

4.3 Any outstanding information or issues: YJB asked if further direct correspondence could continue with the Experts and this was firmly rejected. All correspondence **MUST** be coordinated through Ms. Limová's office in Prague and not from individual States Parties.

4.4 Managing the Evaluation Mission in each town.

4.4.1 Opening presentation – contents and rehearsal. This item was discussed with the SMG.

4.4.2 Walking Tour – final route – each town summarised its route and illustrated the map. Some towns brought printed examples of the tour maps.

4.4.3 Landscape Tour – final route – as above.

4.4.4 Evening reception – not too lavish please and not too late. Whilst there were no special dietary requirements Prof. Kuipers wished to be known as a 'flexitarian' being against eating too much red meat and preferring fish and locally produced foods that did not need excessive 'food-miles' to be imported.

4.4.5 Other documentation to be available - CP illustrated the Bath LMP and it was confirmed that these were needed at each component site. Copies of the property and buffer zone maps would be needed along routes and at all meeting points, as constant reference is likely to be necessary. CP had also produced a file with a detailed page on each element illustrating the attributes for additional reference, these sheets could be printed off and offered to the Experts if they so wished.

4.4.6 Handing development issues – it was necessary to be open about all schemes submitted to ICOMOS; schemes at concept stage, any permissions granted and which developments were approved. The experts are **NOT** to be consulted on

specific developments. It is likely that ICOMOS may request further case studies during the EM.

4.4.7 Press contact following the completion of the Evaluation Mission – each spa town will receive a file of photographs at the end of each stage of the EM. These must NOT be used until the common/overarching statement is agreed in Karlovy Vary on the 2nd October. Each town can then add its own local comments and quotes and a selection of the photographs, but at **NO TIME** should the experts be identified or their names used in publicity.

4.4.8 All sites should keep a note of the issues and comments raised by the Experts for future reference. The Core Team will do the same and any advance notice of particular issues or concerns will be forwarded to those towns not yet visited.

4.4.9 Final versions of all site; programmes and tours MUST be available to the SG by 08:00 on the 6th September to send to Prague for issue to ICOMOS. This is **URGENT**.

4.4.10 Some confusion became apparent over the terminology concerning 'elements' and 'attributes' and BG and on the morning of the second day he held a separate meeting with only the SMG members to review this situation. See Annex 3. In the ND Vol.1 Chapter 3 page 449, see the table "Significance: attributes and features."

5. Post Evaluation Mission timetable: *for information*.

5.1 The evaluation report and the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel. The GSE will never see a copy of the Experts EM report but will be called to Paris on either 20, 21 or 22 November to the ICOMOS WH Panel for a 1.5 hour question and answer session. It is during such a meeting that the first indications of ICOMOS's overall attitude to the ND will immerge.

5.2 Requests for additional information. These will occur during the EM and further information requested afterwards and before the November panel. Prague will coordinate the response to these requests and no individual spa town should respond directly without consultation with Prague.

5.3 ICOMOS recommendations to the World Heritage Committee. These are written after the ICOMOS WH Panel held in February and submitted to UNESCO in March. It is likely that the GSE will be notified on the recommendation being put to the WHC in June/July sometime in May, about 6 weeks before the committee meets.

5.4 Reports to the World Heritage Committee. (To be held in Fuzhou, Fujian Province, SE China in 2020. Dates not yet announced). See 5.3 above.

6. A new proposal for the financial budget 2019: the SG explained the background to the financing of the logistical arrangements for the EM. These had proved to be most complex and difficult and required a significant financial resource to be available at short notice to secure these arrangements via travel agents. A result he had sent an emergency resolution to the GSE member spa towns for the release of € 18,000 on the 8th August. Three member spa towns had not responded and therefore the release of funds was not possible as unanimity was necessary for such an emergency resolution. He had received no explanation as to why this had not occurred. This placed the SG in a most difficult position and only by using the credit limit of both his and his wife's (!) accounts was he able to spend € 16,600 to secure the travel arrangement for the EM. These monies remain outstanding to him. He made it clear to the MSG that he would never allow this to happen again and required immediate re-payment of these funds.

Following further discussion in which the SG presented a full account of the costs incurred **It was agreed that** funds of € 16,646.03 would be re-paid to him as soon as possible having received the approval of SS as Financial Controller and LP as Finance Manager. Following further discussion and following a recommendation made earlier in the summer by MSG Chair, Margret Mergen **It was agreed that** funds of € 10,000 would be forwarded to the SG on credit and, on a monthly basis would be accounted for and 'topped-up' at the end of each month following the presentation of expenditure receipts against the capital sum of €10,000. KB wished to record that:

- This must never be allowed to happen again.
- That an 'up-front' credit allowance of € 10,000 must be made available to the SG.
- That thanks must be recorded to the SG for enabling the arrangements for the EM to be put in place.

6.1 The 2019 revised budget – this was presented by the SG and **APPROVED**. See Annex 4.

6.2 Managing increasing costs; administration and marketing – a lengthy discussion took place concerning an increase in funds from 2020 onwards, and a number of proposals immersed with votes being taken on each proposal:

6.2.1 For no increase in membership fees for 2020. **Votes received 2.**

6.2.2 To maintain status quo concerning increases to membership fees from 2020 onwards as agreed at MSG 18 4th June 2018. **Votes received 3.**

6.2.3 To increase the fees agreed in June 2018 by 20% for 2020. **Votes received 8.**

6.2.4 To increase the fees agreed in June 2018 by 25% for 2020. **Votes received 2.**

6.2.5 A proposal to double the fees for 2020 was **withdrawn**.

6.3 How to fund increasing costs. The decision taken in item 6.2 therefore increases the 2020 membership fees to which are due for payment on the 1st January 2020:

Item	GSE Spa town	2018 decision €	2020 payment € Following 20% increase
1	Baden bei Wien	9,000	10,800
2	Spa	6,750	8,100
3	Františkovy Lázně	6,750	8,100
4	Karlovy Vary	16,325	19,580
5	Mariánske Lázně	6,750	8,100
6	Vichy	9,000	10,800
7	Bad Ems	6,750	8,100
8	Baden-Baden	16,325	19,580

9	Bad Kissingen	9,000	10,800
10	Montecatini Terme	9,000	10,800
11	City of Bath	16,325	19,580
	Total budget	111,975	134,340

6.4 Preliminary budget for 2020; the SG presented a preliminary budget for 2020 which is attached at Annex 5. This remains a preliminary working budget for the time being.

7. Constitutional matters and future management arrangements: *for information*.
 - 7.1 The “official line” concerning overall progress.
 - 7.2 An update on any thoughts by member spa towns.
 - 7.3 Corporate status; preferred options – an update.
 - 7.4 Transition to Great Spas Management Board (GSMB).
 - 7.5 Location of Great Spas HQ.
 - 7.6 2020 staffing resources.
8. Marketing Strategy – anything further to report: *for information and depending on further input from the marketing sub-group*.
 - 8.1 Marketing Strategy development.
 - 8.2 Communications coordination – externally and internally.
 - 8.3 Social media.
 - 8.4 Website.
 - 8.5 Research proposals.
9. Any other business.
10. Date and place of the next MSG meeting: MSG meeting nr23; 3, 4 or 5th December 2019??
11. Meetings in 2020. Frequency. Location.