HERITAGE AND THE METROPOLIS

CURRENT STATUS, EMERGING TRENDS AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO SUSTAINABILITY

A systematic comparative analysis based on individual city reports

HERITOPOLIS WORKING PAPERS | VOLUME 1

HERITOPOLIS

UN-Habitat UNI Consortium on Metropolitan Heritage

Supported by:

UN-HABITAT

MetroHUB

UNI

UN-HABITAT'S PARTNERSHIP WITH UNIVERSITIES WORLDWIDE

HERITAGE AND THE METROPOLIS: CURRENT STATUS, EMERGING TRENDS AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO SUSTAINABILITY – A SYSTEMATIC COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS BASED ON INDIVIDUAL CITY REPORTS

Heritopolis Working Papers | Volume 1

Acknowledgements

Coordination: Heritopolis Society
Mike Turner, David Simon.

Authors: Heritopolis Society: David Simon, Claus-Peter Echter and Can Emre Memiş.

Contributors: External
Authors of individual city reports on which this analysis is based: Eugènia Vidal Casanovas (Barcelona), Zhengxin Liao, Wen Shi, Feifei Feng, Nan Ye and Jian Liu (Beijing), Lucia Pesci (Buenos Aires), Jana Chaudhuri (Delhi), Murat Güvenç (Istanbul), Joanna Sanetra-Szeliga (Kraków), Clemency Gibbs (London), Valentina Galiulo and Nicole de Togni (Milan), Ksenia Mezenina (Moscow), Moses Gates (New York), Laurent Coudroy de Lille (Paris), Daniel Almeida (Rio de Janeiro), Hyunjae Kim (Seoul), Jian Zhou, Xingyu Mu and Fei Chen (Shanghai) and Adva Matar (Tel Aviv).

Peer-review: UN-Habitat
Remy Sietchiping, Rafael H. Forero H.

Advisory Board: Heritopolis Society
Mike Turner, Francesco Bandarin, Jaeheon Choi, Antonella Contin, Eric Huybrechts, Franklin van den Hoeven, Vera Tangari, Ying Jin, Jihon Kim.

Layout: Monica Castro.
Cover Design: Komal Potdar. Digital illustration by Monica Castro, generated by artificial intelligence platforms at https://firefly.adobe.com/generate/inpaint, https://www.pica-ai.com/es/ai-art-generator/

HERITAGE AND THE METROPOLIS

CURRENT STATUS, EMERGING TRENDS AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO SUSTAINABILITY

A systematic comparative analysis based on individual city reports

HERITOPOLIS WORKING PAPERS | VOLUME 1

HERITOPOLIS
UN-Habitat UNI Consortium on Metropolitan Heritage

Supported by:
UN-HABITAT
MetroHUB
UNI
UN-HABITAT'S PARTNERSHIP WITH UNIVERSITIES WORLDWIDE

Table of Contents

Preface

Heritage and Metropolis (Heritopolis) is a loose research network established during 2021 to explore how metropolises are being (re-)shaped by heritage redefining their meaning. This largest category of city is growing rapidly in number and their demographic, economic and governance importance globally. Metropolises are also where many of the sustainability and resilience challenges – including potential loss of natural and cultural heritage – are particularly profound. Recognising these dramatic changes, our research began by posing questions such as 'What specific role heritage can play in 21st century metropolises?' and 'What are the limits of the current heritage paradigms and how metropolitan authorities can change them?'

The work undertaken to date, including the initial analysis of our first baseline survey reported here, confirms the validity of the initial hypothesis: that there is indeed a need to delve deeper into the nature of metropolitan identities and that this is likely to bring significant innovation in the heritage field as an enabler for sustainable development.

Heritopolis addresses these challenges linking research and practice to the UN-Habitat UNI MetroHUB partnership within the framework of the New Urban Agenda and SDGs. The Heritopolis research forum will provide the debate and discussion needed to better understand these trends and share experiences over a wide range of disciplines and metropolises. There is no saving without creation – the architecture of today will be the heritage of tomorrow.

To date, 20 metropolises have joined or are considering joining the network, namely Bangalore, Barcelona, Beijing, Buenos Aires, Cape Town, Delhi, Istanbul, Johannesburg, Kraków, London, Milan, Mombasa, Moscow, New York, Paris, Randstad Holland, Rio de Janeiro, Seoul, Shanghai, Sydney and Tel Aviv. We encourage more to join.[1] Fifteen of them have participated in the baseline survey reported here but the others will contribute to future Heritopolis research.

[1] *See Conclusions below for relevant details.*

1. Introduction

This report provides a preliminary comparative analysis of responses received from city teams participating in the baseline survey during 2022 designed by the informal leadership group.[2] These are Barcelona, Beijing, Buenos Aires, Delhi, Istanbul, Kraków, London, Milan, Moscow, New York, Paris, Rio de Janeiro, Seoul, Shanghai and Tel Aviv. This survey was designed to collect information from the cities on five thematic sets of questions as a foundation to inform development of the Heritopolis agenda and future work plan. These sections addressed the current situation; emerging trends; perspectives on the future; key questions about heritage and sustainability; and engagement with relevant Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) respectively. In undertaking this analysis, the current situation and most of the key questions have been combined into one section in order to maximise coherence and minimise overlap and duplication. Several questions about use of the SDGs, New Urban Agenda (NUA), UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape and other tools have also been combined into a separate section. The individual city reports on which this analysis draws, and from which the direct quotations below are taken, are available on the Heritpolis website at *http://heritopolis.org/reports/?uid=18&mod=document&pageid=1*

Inevitably, with such a globally diverse set of cities in different national and regional socio-cultural and geopolitical contexts, the survey responses differ considerably in the level of detail on the different components, and the emphasis and priorities these reflect. The first stage of work was to collate the responses into a standard format in Excel spreadsheets, with one sheet per thematic section. This facilitated verification of responses and follow-up to try to fill any gaps. The spreadsheets were then used as the basis for the summary analysis that follows, highlighting and assessing the range of responses on each variable or question. Not all cities provided responses on all sections, and this is reflected in the coverage of the respective sections. This overview will in turn facilitate subsequent more detailed thematic analysis for publication and funding applications. The following sections assess the respective sections of questions. Because of their size, the spreadsheets are not attached to this report.

[2] *This comprised the initiators of Heritopolis – Mike Turner, Fracesco Bandarin, JaeHeon Choi, Eric Huybrechts, Antonella Contin, Claus-Peter Echter and David Simon.*

2. Current Situation

This initial part of the survey describes the role played by heritage in the metropolises and the existing policy framework that addresses heritage identification, conservation, management and promotion at the scale of the metropolis.

There is no definite and firm layer of consciousness of the object of a metropolis among the cases analysed. What makes up the nature and identity of the metropolis and what constitutes its cultural values? The metropolises differ considerably in levels of awareness and agenda. This reflects many of the issues addressed below but also the length of time since the metropolitan authority was established in each case, its powers and responsibilities relative to the constituent municipalities or other forms of council, and specific local political conditions.

One of the main characteristics is their complexity and their speed of transformation. The metropolitan urban fabric can be read not only in terms of density, but also of grain describing the mix of uses in every area or describing the city as a set of dynamic patchworks at varying measurement intensity, held together by eminent points and the junctions of the green-grey infrastructure. A characteristic element is the way in which the urban and rural elements of an ecosystem function, particularly the dimensions of conflict and conflicted heritage are included. Heritage in the metropolis differs from embrace conflict-laden and conflicted heritages.

The current general heritage-related challenges in cities are: sustainable development, resilience as the most striking topic, climate change, international and urban-rural migration. But these challenges are more stringent in metropolises. And the differences between the diverse towns and regions in a metropolis are a crucial issue too.

Some metropolises, like Paris and London, contain very important cultural heritage, to the point of being highly distinctive in this respect. Heritage functions as an asset for the economic attractiveness of a world-leading tourist destination but often there is a lack of heritage policy. In other metropolises like Moscow, heritage conservation practice even has an objective and symbolic nature. The integrity of the environment (protected zones), the surroundings of the monument and authenticity, and the integrity of the architectural concept are often not considered when planning conservation measures. Indeed, on the contrary, the integrity of the original homogeneous architectural concept is often broken and historic materials are replaced.

The heritage of the Latin American metropolitan areas included in this survey, namely Buenos Aires and Rio de Janeiro, nowadays comprises a heterogeneous amalgam of sites, landscapes and intangible asssets in the historic Spanish or Portuguese cores, themselves conserved or replaced by newer buildings to differing extents, and those in more recent surrounding areas reflecting the architectural styles and land use mixes current when they were constructed. The social groups inhabiting some areas today are very different from those for whom they were designed, while others – particularly elite suburbs – have retained more of their original identities. Similar complexity characterizes other former colonial or imperial metropolises in the region, including Quito, which boasts the

largest and best-preserved Spanish colonial core and which is a UNESCO World Heritage Site. Mexico City and others with indigenous components predating European conquest, have even more complex urban structure and social fabrics.

The following six subsections synthesize comparatively the historical contexts, evolution and different dimensions of the current situation in the respective metropolises.

a) Can you provide a short historical background of your metropolis?

Cultural heritage in the various metropolises is extremely rich. Istanbul, a gateway between the Balkans, Anatolia, the Black Sea and the Mediterranean is endowed with an outstanding architectural heritage reflecting a unique combination of eastern and western, northern, and Mediterranean cultures. Delhi comprises remnants of its historic capital cities of several ruling dynasties and reveals seven capital cities within the present city. Beijing has a history of more than 3,000 years. Whereas both London and Seoul were founded at least 2,000 years ago and have experienced several important defining periods as historic cities in very different world regions, Rio de Janeiro had its origin in the 16th century. Kraków, one of the smaller metropolitan cities, has been a political and administrative centre since the Middle Ages. Although certain parts of present-day Tel Aviv metropolis date back to Roman times or beyond (for instance, the ancient harbour of Jaffa was established about 3,800 years ago), the modern city and metropolis arose since the late 19th Century, and, as in Shanghai, there are gaps between the management and perspectives of antiquities and Modernism. The Parisian heritage is the product of a rather continual conception of the metropolis.

b) When and how have the definitions of heritage and its protection expanded or evolved over time since they were first listed and protected?

The preservation of heritage in Paris has a long history, going back to the 19th century. In Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Aires, it began in 1937, with the listing of cultural assets in Rio and the institution of the first state bureaucratic structure, the 'Superintendency of Museums and Historic Places', in Argentina. A regional and municipal heritage policy in Rio de Janeiro was established in the 1970s and 1980s. The Milan Metropolitan Territorial Plan is the first nationally recognized Plan of this kind together with that of Bologna, including new global development goals. In Moscow the law on cultural heritage objects was adopted in 2003, and the majority of heritage sites remain state property.

On the National level, China commenced heritage preservation in 1982, with the Cultural Relics Protection Law. The conservation process in Beijing can be divided into four stages. In 1980s the old city was protected, in 1990 and the beginning of the 21st century the focus shifted to the integrated system for conserving the historic city, with emphasis on the urban layout and macro environments. From 2017 to the present, a conservation framework has been constructed, comprising four zones, the old city, the surrounding central urban area, Beijing Municipality, and the entire Beijing - Tianjin - Hebei region. In 1986, the State Council approved Shanghai as the one of the second batch on the List of national famous Historical Cities in China.

Throughout its historical development, Istanbul has become a multi-layered city with some 125-classified archaeological, historical, and urban sites. In 1985, UNESCO registered 'the Historic Areas of Istanbul' on the World Heritage List, while Kraków's Old Town was included already in 1978 as one of the first such sites. The UNESCO

List also includes other sites located in Kraków's close vicinity. The Polish national legal framework on the protection and care of monuments of 2003 is decisive for the city of Kraków. At the local/municipal level programmes for the monument's protection of the municipality of Kraków have been intensified since 2014 – a work in progress. On the local and municipal level In New York, only the architecture of the landmarks and historic districts can be preserved. These protections have evolved very little since the Landmarks Law of the 1965 and the addition of historic districts shortly thereafter.

c) The main regulations, planning and governance systems that support cultural heritage in the metropolitan area and their general timeline of formation

Details of all the principal laws, ordinances and related regulations at municipal and metropolitan levels in each city have been collected and collated. The Barcelona Metropolitan Area (AMB) is a public administration that manages the metropolitan area of Barcelona and aims to improve the quality of life for residents. The AMB takes a holistic approach to managing cultural and natural heritage. The construction of a metropolitan narrative in this field is something new, as heritage has traditionally been considered either national or of only local interest. The future metropolitan master plan (PDU), which focuses on preserving this by improving urban areas, connecting them with the environment, and incorporating green spaces. Three metropolitan heritage conservation programmes include socio-environmental restoration of river areas, parks, and the creation of a network of industrial and cultural heritage. The focus on green infrastructure in metropolitan Barcelona aims to promote sustainable development by creating networks of natural and cultural heritage. These initiatives are linked to issues such as cultural and natural tourism, climate change, biodiversity, health and well-being and sustainable mobility.

At the national level in China, the Chinese Cultural Heritage Protection Law 2007 was followed by a regulation on the Protection of famous Historical and Cultural Cities, Towns and Villages 2008 and 2017. In 2005, Beijing formulated the Regulations on the Conservation of the Historic City of Beijing and revised them in 2021. According to the regulations, the municipal government steers the overall planning of the conservation of the historic city, co-ordinates key conservation issues, formulates standards, policies, and regulations (2021), and implements high-standard planning approval procedures for conservation zoning, planning of cultural relics, historic conservation areas, and utilization of both urban and rural heritages. Since the 1990s Shanghai pursues a Heritage Conservation Strategy including urban regenerations regulations after 2014. Shanghai has formed a comprehensive system for famous cities, towns, and villages, covering all protected rivers, areas, and streets. The institutions in charge of the urban heritage protection are the urban planning and the cultural relics departments. Shanghai has gradually formed a management system with different levels of planning for the Protection of national Famous Historical and Cultural Cities, of Areas Rich in Historical and Cultural Features, and of monumental buildings.

The Jiangnan culture is the cultural underpinning of the Shanghai metropolitan area. For thousands of years, the dense network of rivers and lakes that is characteristic of the Jiangnan regions has cultivated a vast cultural phenomenon of water towns, with unique cultural landscapes, historical towns, and traditional buildings.

In 1983 the legal framework for conservation in Turkey was enacted and subsequently amended in 2004, 2008 and 2011 to introduce new definitions and concepts within the scope of accession talks to the European Union. In 2005, the Metropolitan Municipality Law was adopted. A new municipal bureau for Conservation, Implementation and Inspection (KUDEB)

was established. Since 2015, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality (IMM) Heritage Department has developed a heritage inventory database and oversees and manages heritage projects such as maintenance, repair, restoration works in the city. The historic built environment in Istanbul was barely able to withstand the development pressure due to unprecedented population increase and has been transformed by large-scale urban interventions. To alleviate the threats to urban historical heritage, new concepts are introduced. Heritage which previously was mainly associated with monuments was gradually extended to cover the entire fabric. Cultural heritage must be preserved and go beyond physical reinforcement in order to be passed on to future generations.

Protection of cultural heritage in Delhi occurs in three layers: at the national level for monuments of national importance, at the state level for monuments of state importance, and at the local level through municipal-level categories. In London, heritage policy is formulated at all three scales but protection occurs only through designations at national and local/ metropolitan levels. In other metropolises, like Moscow, the integrity of the protected zones, the surroundings of the monument and authenticity are often not considered in planning conservation measures.

In Kraków, the legal framework for activities in the scope of heritage management on the national level is based on the acts of 2003 on the Protection and Care of Monuments, and the Spatial Planning Act. The programme for the Monuments Protection and for the Rehabilitation of the Municipality of Kraków is a work in progress. In 2021 The Kraków Metropolitan Association prepared a strategic document, 'Strategy of the Kraków Metropolis 2030', which was a pioneering document of supra-local development for the city of Kraków and its surrounding communes. An important component of this objective is the promotion of landscape, cultural and natural values, as well as intangible cultural heritage.

Heritage in New York is mainly informal. Cultural Institutions and museums represent almost every aspect of heritage. The heritage system in Paris is solid and has high legitimacy. At the national level in Argentina, the 1913 Law on Archaeological Protection inaugurated the legislative procedure in matters of cultural property. At the provincial level of Buenos Aires State, various laws have been promoted and developed that protect heritage. But the Buenos Aires state and city governments have unfortunately shown that the first priority on their agenda is the real estate business, and that has provoked patrimonial catastrophes, the Law of Heritage Protection, for example, which mandates the protection of buildings constructed before 1941, was not passed until 2008.

In Israel, the inscription of buildings and objects occurs strictly at the local level. Tel Aviv district has no integrated metropolitan heritage conservation policy, so there is no such layer of consciousness in metropolitan Tel Aviv. The regional planning committee manages the metropolis, which deals with needs of planning that derive from local needs from the cities in the region. Every city makes its own policies regarding heritage. As a result. there are gaps in decision making, which lead to disparities in execution and design in heritage areas (Tel Aviv Report, 2022).

d) How has the value of intangible heritage been discussed in the metropolis?

Intangible cultural heritage is discussed in some metropolises as in various governmental, academic and civil society discourses and well acknowledged but not protected. In other metropolises there is little debate on this subject.

"… Intangible cultural heritage in China refers to various traditional cultural expressions that have been handed down from generation to generation…" Beijing's intangible cultural heritage is protected by inventories, records, archives, and other measures. In Istanbul, 31

urban sectors are included in the city guide, where intangible cultural heritage values are kept alive. Wood carving, copper work, glasswork, seal making, marbling, miniature, hand drawn mother-of-pearl inlay, ceramic and tiles are listed as living treasures. The planning of historical and cultural conservation and utilisation is oriented towards revitalising historic heritage. Intangible heritage should be classified and assessed in detailed planning. Protection and inheritance requirements should be proposed. Kraków acquired an additional level of heritage protection when it was recognized as Monument of History in 1994 thanks to its unique, universal, historical, artistic, and important intangible heritage values. The metropolitan city itself is the spiritual capital of Poland.

In New York, heritage as a legal concept is fixed in a certain geographical place. In this metropolis the intangible aspects are difficult to regulate and preserve. In terms of intangible heritage in Seoul, the system of preserving and utilising intangible historical assets provides metropolitan Seoul citizens with wider opportunities to experience traditional culture. The value of the modernist heritage in Tel Aviv changed over recent decades from an object-oriented analysis to greater appreciation of the greater value and quality of the fabric, the urban context and strength. This blends tangible and intangible dimensions of heritage, reflecting Tel Aviv and Jaffa's multicultural status. The TA 5500 Master Plan is currently being updated to include social attributes of historic cities. In Buenos Aires, both tangible and intangible legacies, like the unique Tango dance form, are of great importance.

e) What is the impact of heritage policies of the metropolis upon nationwide heritage policies?

The metropolises mostly being the capitals of their nations have their influences. The pattern was followed in making master plans or nominating World Heritage Sites. In other cities of the country, there is often in a metropolis greater scope for heritage's potential to be acknowledged and explored but likewise heritage can also be a source of tension and conflict and the heart of conservation about dissonant and contested heritage. It is important that national regulation and policies apply to the metropolis, because the pressure on land and real estate in theses globalized metropolises is very strong. Seoul is regarded as an exemplary case in urban heritage management, with a more efficient exploration than on a national level. In a Latin American metropolis there is no link between local and national preservation policies.

Because of the richness of it historic and cultural heritage and its complex socio-economic background, Beijing has been an explorer and pioneer in the innovation of heritage concepts and how to deal with the relationship between conservation and development nationwide. For example, through long-term exploration and practice, Beijing has researched the Code for Engineering Pipelines Comprehensive Planning of Historic Conservation Area to deal with the contradiction between traditional spatial forms and modern infrastructure, which has served as a model for technological innovation in the protection of historic conservation areas nationwide.

44 regions have completed their Plan for the Protection of Areas Rich in Special Historical and Cultural features since 2004, providing a strong basis for the protection of Shanghai's urban historical and cultural heritage.

New York City has been a leader in physical preservation throughout the Landmarks law of 1965, which is stronger than the Federal and State law regarding architectural preservation.

f) How is natural heritage preserved and protected in the metropolis?

In most metropolises there is a direct link and connection between the presence of natural heritage and human-made heritage, usually termed cultural heritage. The relationship and approach often need to be recognized in a more holistic way, not least since natural and cultural heritage responsibilities commonly lie with different organisations. Important natural heritage assets are the water systems, not least since many heritage buildings are located next to water. Natural heritage comprises the main element in the constitution of metropolitan cultural landscapes with slopes, rivers, lakes, parks, open spaces, water courses, woods and forest canopies, scenic areas and often beaches as landscape characteristics, among important elements. Because all metropolises are protagonists of exponential growth, especially in economic terms, and show a heavy increase and concentration of the population, there have been strong efforts to preserve and protect the environment and natural heritage by various organisations and the municipality. So, for example, in Istanbul, provisions to contain developments that would directly or indirectly affect conservation decisions to a considerable extent were approved. In Moscow, legislation concerning safeguarding natural heritage in the metropolis is much stricter than concerning cultural heritage. In Rio de Janeiro, natural heritage is the main element in the constitution of the metropolis's cultural landscape, and has been protected by several federal, state, and municipal regulations from the 1990s onwards. In Shanghai in 2021, the Yangtze River Delta Integration Demonstration Zone launched:

> *… the Planning and Construction Guidelines for the Pilot Zone of the Yangtze River Delta Ecological Green Integrated Development Demonstration Zone. This is the first cross-provincial and construction guideline in China. The guidelines are applicable to the 660 square kilometres of the early start-up area and could be adapted to the overall scope of the model area (2413 km2). The Guidelines stipulate that the construction of the demonstration zone must aim for integration and high quality and must highlight ecological and green development (Shanghai Report, 2022).*

g) This issue was explored further via a follow-up question on how innovatively the metropolis promotes cultural and natural heritage as key features of diversity and richness in identity formation and future ambitions?

The level of innovation varies, sometimes in terms of strategic measures such as the Province of Buenos Aires' Undersecretary of Creative Industries and Cultural Innovation. Moscow has no such innovative focus.

National-level debates and policies can also provide influential, such as how the economic, social, and environmental benefits of heritage are recognised within UK national and regional planning policy. Within London, heritage is contained within definitions of good growth and sustainable development in the London Plan but there is certainly greater scope for realising the potential of heritage. Nevertheless, heritage can also be a source of tension and conflict, and London is currently at the heart of national conversations around contested heritage and the re-evaluation of what, and whom, should be memorialised and why.

In Barcelona the main innovations relate to three different aspects – the approach, the focus, and the tools. The approach is diverse, integrated and multi-scale, with an effort to reinforce a metropolitan identity formation. The different proposals seek to have social, economic, and environmental impacts. Issues integrated into the heritage approach to date have included sustainable mobility, health and wellbeing, tourism, and

local economic activity. Key novelties in relation to the focus are the expansion of the concept of heritage and new visions of the territory. In terms of tools, a wide range of apps and online viewers are used. Similarly, the Kraków Municipality perceives cultural heritage not as burden but rather as a resource that can be used to solve socio-economic problems. During the COVID-19 pandemic, historic places and monuments served as tools to support the local tourism market.

In Seoul, the concept of future heritage is defined as modern/contemporary historical resources related to the identity and memory of most citizens as the basis for heritage designations. The process to select the future heritage sites emphasised the voluntary recommendation by citizens and the collaborative process of decision-making with not only heritage experts but also local communities. The Seoul Future Heritage was launched in 2012 as a legal and institutional device led by the Seoul Metropolitan Government (SMG) in terms of its Ordinance on Conservation, Management and Utilization of Future Heritage. A separate Ordinance on Conservation and Promotion of Cultural Diversity sets out policies related to cultural diversity.

h) The role played by culture and cultural heritage in metropolitan reports

Which exist only in a minority of metropoles covered by this survey, tends to reflect the priority attached to cultural heritage and the instruments enacted in that light. For instance, in Buenos Aires, cultural policies have become considerably more prominent in recent decades, emphasising plurality and diversity as tools not just to promote access for formal facilities and performances like museums and shows, but also to transform social relations and promote creativity and influence in civic life. However, this is most advanced within the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires, where cultural and creative industries continue to grow in importance, generating over 9% of national gross value added, rather than at the metropolitan level.

In Barcelona, the draft metropolitan report refers to natural and cultural heritage initiatives undertaken by the different departments within AMB. However, no specific section in the text deal with this matter. In the Beijing report, cultural development is an important section, that includes the annual work of conservation of historical and cultural heritage. The activities related to culture and cultural heritage are incorporated in the annual IMM reports in Istanbul and in the Kraków Development Strategy 2030.

In London, the metropolitan Greater London Authority operates strategically, and the London Plan (approved in 2021) includes heritage within its definitions of good growth, contains policies addressing the historic environment and also covers heritage in various other policies and objectives. Whilst the London Plan does allow some flexibility for community-valued assets to be given protection, and local planning authorities have mechanisms such as local lists of heritage assets and the designation of conservation areas to offer greater reach, there are disagreements as to whether existing planning framework (under which the majority of heritage is managed) is properly equipped to incorporate greater representation. The current focus of heritage management remains on the tangible; since heritage is managed predominantly through the planning system, Intangible heritage is unsatisfactorily represented.

The re-evaluation of heritage and the different values connected to it is an issue being explored across the UK and in London, where several initiatives over the last twenty years have sought to explore the complexity of London's many identities. These issues are deep-rooted, however, and recent global events, as well as more local campaigns, have publicly highlighted the fact that some of London's communities continue to feel overlooked, undervalued, and underrepresented.

Moscow has no comprehensive metropolitan report but submits annual reports on 14 regional state programmes, one of which is Moscow Culture. This contains sub-programmes on formal facilities and events but also the development of interregional and international cultural relations, of human resources and of scientific and methodological support, and protection, conservation, use and promotion of cultural heritage sites. The report includes various quantitative indicators. The Seoul Metropolitan Government also publishes an annual plan for the preservation, utilisation and management of cultural heritage. The 2021 plan identifies four key tasks, namely discovery of cultural heritage and expansion of designations; continuous and systematic preservation and management; utilisation and activation; and preservation and management of the Seoul City Wall. The report details 88 specific projects, including to have the City Wall designated a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

i) How, if at all, are indigenous/traditional cultural sites and monuments, events, rituals and other practices included within the metropolitan approach to heritage?

Again, following from answers to the previous few, there is considerable diversity. Responses range from a lack of explicit inclusion where official attitudes and policies are not conducive, to deliberate and comprehensive inclusion through at least inclusive and semi-participatory processes, such as that about to be launched by the Greater London Authority (GLA) and Historic England to develop the GLA's London Heritage Plan over the next few years. Sometimes cultural heritage is represented by means of a landscape-based approach, such as the delta, Pampean region, urban area, Rio de la Plata, and coast in metropolitan Buenos Aires. However, the various planning instruments do not consider the cultural landscape directly. Intangible heritage is covered by national legislation adopting the relevant international conventions.

Because the ethnic and cultural homogeneity of metropolitan Barcelona has changed, with a view to heritage concepts, it is apt to reflect on the social and cultural diversity of this metropolis, especially regarding the different migration waves. Beijing attaches great importance to the preservation of its unique historical and cultural heritage, most typically the preservation of the traditional built environment of hutongs and the siheyuan courtyard compound unique to Beijing, as well as of national representatives of traditional Chinese culture like the Great Wall, the Forbidden City, the Temple of Heaven, all World Heritage Sites and the Central Axis, part of the Tentative list of China.

Kraków has faced the problem of "disinherited heritage, a heritage without inheritors", which refers to the heritage of the Jewish community that made up 25% of the city's population before the Holocaust. While local authorities have focused on conserving some selected sites, they were not proactive enough in preserving the Jewish District, which has since become a popular bar and café area. The neighbouring Pódgorze district has done a better job of preserving its heritage through the creation of a memorial square. Another area of significant Jewish history in the city is the former KL Plaszow work camp, which is now recognized as a war cemetery.

The UK is largely aligned with international thinking on heritage management (a 3-grade listing system was introduced after World War Two, and area-based protection in 1967 soon after the Venice Charter), but diverges in one key area, intangible heritage. The UK has not signed the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage; intangible heritage is maintained and preserved by communities, with some funding available from the Arts Council and Heritage Lottery Fund but is not currently managed through the planning framework. This may, however, change once the London Heritage Strategy (see above) is adopted. In London there are more than 19,000 statutorily listed

buildings. For heritage assets that do not meet the standards of national importance there are two main mechanisms for protection: Conservation Areas which offer area-based protection and are designated by the Local Planning Authority, and locally listed structures, which often reflect the assets valued by communities. Registered Parks & Gardens offer statutory protection, and London has 168 such areas of designation. There is an elaborate system relating to London's four World Heritage Sites and policy on future designations.

In sharp contrast, there is no comparable agenda or articulated approach to promote indigenous heritage within the Moscow metropolis. Some strong traditional localities, like Jewish quarter, maintain their cultural sustainability and develop due to strongly established community engagement and cultural continuity.

This question actually raises one key challenge that merits problematisation and investigation later in the Heritopolis programme, namely how indigeneity and 'tradition' are understood and codified in the respective metropolitan and national contexts. This is discussed in the Conclusions below.

j) Which other stakeholders play active roles in heritage management/conservation?

The questions posed to the respective city researchers were deliberately complementary in an effort to avoid gaps and ensure that issues perceived and organised in different ways in individual cities would be captured. Accordingly, the scope for potential overlap is acknowledged, and this comparative assessment of the responses seeks to avoid duplication by means of cross-referencing. This one is no exception since key entities beyond metropolitan and municipal authorities active in the heritage sphere have already been identified in answers to earlier questions and these details will not be repeated. The range of important players varies hugely, but generally includes specific national and provincial or regional ministries, departments or statutory agencies, non-government organisations (NGOs), civil society groups, academic institutions, research institutes and private firms – including trusts and foundations owning or controlling individual monuments, sites and localities. In many cities, the list is exhaustive and the challenges of inventorising, managing and developing coherent and inclusive policies become extremely complex, potentially conflictual and hence even impracticable.

3. The Extent to Which the Metropolises Engage with Global Heritage and Sustainable Development Agendas

This section seeks to understand how and to what extent each metropolitan authority is engaging with global governance tools and instruments to advance heritage activities and measure progress in that regard. Some or all of the SDGs are incorporated into the metropolitan policies of many metropolises, but sometimes in a rather reduced way for two reasons: it is the national state that mostly conducts this policy and since the international position of the metropolis is not questioned, there is little re-examination and adaptation of SDGs to the modalities of protection and conservation of cultural heritage.

The responses received are varied and ultimately reflect the divisions of powers, responsibilities and resources among the various local government bodies. These are weighted strongly towards individual municipalities, boroughs and equivalent bodies, with metropolitan areas generally having small heritage roles. Hence, even where a metro authority engages actively with the SDGs and/or the New Urban Agenda, as in London, Moscow and Barcelona, heritage dimensions – particularly relating to cultural heritage – are generally not directly addressed o perceived as being directly relevant to these. For instance, the Barcelona Metropolitan Area (AMB) references the SDGs and NUA in its Metropolitan Action Plan 2019-2023 and in its follow-up, its various international collaborations and EU funding streams, and engagements in city networks, but heritage does not form an explicit component. The Kraków authorities claim that they lack the knowledge and tools to address culture and heritage relating to the SDGs and NUA, while the fact that such reporting is voluntary provides no incentive to remedy this quickly.

Seoul Metropolitan Government is an exception, having announced the Seoul Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 2030 in 2018. Reflecting the SMG's roles and responsibilities, Goals 8 (Decent work and economic growth); 11 (Sustainable cities and communities), and 15 (Life on land) include targets related to culture and natural heritage (8.7, 11.4 and 15.3), which are being actively pursued. Conversely, while the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires (CABA), the core city within the metropolitan region, is active in relation to the SDGs, NUA and has undertaken its first VLR, this is not true for all municipalities or the entire metropole.

The draft vision document for Delhi intends to strengthen efforts to implement SDG Goal 11 to make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable and specifically Target 11.4 to protect and safeguard the cultural and natural heritage. The vision document has identified specific indicators for this target: World Heritage Sites, historical sites free of encroachment, adequate tourist sites. The Sustainable Development Strategy of Milan is remarkable in establishing internal governance involving public universities and other local stakeholders. The Metropolitan City of Milan is about to conclude the path that led it to develop the Metropolitan-Urban Agenda for Sustainable Development, which includes all 17 SDGs. Furthermore, the Metropolitan City of Milan has developed an IT platform capable of measuring and

evaluating sustainable project strategies, in decision making process and already puts in action advanced process and tools for planning operationally for monitoring and evaluating the natural and cultural heritage of the metropolis.

Beijing submits annual reports on historic heritage conservation as part of the overall annual report on land space planning submitted to the Capital Planning and Construction Commission at national government level, but with the exception of UNESCO in relation to world heritage sites, there is no reporting to the UN or other global bodies on the SDGs or NUA.

Istanbul's Vision 2050 strategy and related reports, as outlined in Section 4 below, are inspired by MDGs (Millennium Development Goals), SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals), New Urban Agenda and various international sustainable development summits and declarations. These are to be operationalized through some 246 objectives. The extent to which these have been mainstreamed effectively will be revealed by progress in implementation over the coming years.

4. Emerging Issues and Trends

This section describes the visions of the studied metropolises regarding the development of heritage policies in the next 30 years as a normal span of time for metropolitan frameworks of urban heritage.

a) How will demography and physical changes affect the perception and the role of heritage in the metropolis?

Most metropolises will grow in the next 20 years, often by 50%, due to population increase and to in-migration. Even Tel Aviv will double in size, while some other metropolitan areas will expand spatially in the future. There is a growing need for new housing. Facilities and open spaces will become increasingly inadequate. As the metropolis grows, built heritage suffers more pressure from the real estate market and could be replaced. On the other hand, the need to preserve heritage becomes more evident in the eyes of citizens and interested groups. Such pressures are strongly evident in Istanbul, constituting a major threat to the integrity of the city's urban sustainability and causing irreversible losses. Numerous planning decisions, adopted laws and regulations, devised to protect the city's cultural and natural heritage were only partially successful, so that its demographic and social resilience, sustainable development processes and the protection of its cultural and architectural heritage have been negatively affected. Rising development pressure, population growth, uncontrolled urban sprawl, the inaccurately designated industrial zones, inadequate urban transport policies, rampant land prices and speculation put at stake the preservation of large historical sectors.

Beijing has entered the stage of urban renew, and is now focusing on improving the quality of existing neighbourhoods and buildings rather than continuing to expand outwards. In an effort to avoid the pressures just mentioned, this upgrading includes preserving traditional palaces, temples, and courtyards, as well as modern industrial plants, multi-rise residences, and abandoned railroads and smokehouses. The city government has also increased the focus on archaeological excavations, protecting valuable sites and turning some of them into heritage parks.

New York's greatest strength has been its changing demography and cultural diversification. In addition to more immigrants and ethnic groups, as more identities become visible, culture and heritage follow – for instance, the Gay Rights movement and the visibility that followed in the 1960s and 1970s produced community institutions, art, museums a major parade, and countless other cultural contributions to more recent heritage.

The pandemic itself was and still is a challenge, with the change in habits and that are already occurring, such as teleworking, fewer trips, disuse of some heritage buildings in the centre, repurposing of others and lack of equipment for conversions to housing.

b) Will heritage play a greater role in cultural policies, governance, regulations, and in the overall construction of the identity of the metropolis and of its different parts?

Many inhabitants move out from historic city cores to new properties into the periphery. They will have a new perception of their metropolis and its heritage. The notion of time layers and evolution of the metropolis is growing, the concept of heritage begins to gradually expand. But generally, in all metropolises, heritage has a greater role to play in the construction of the local identity of the metropolis and of its different parts. Ideal is the role of heritage in Milan, where landscape at the metropolitan scale is regarded *"as a palimpsest of tangible permanencies interlaced by intangible meanings: irrigation canals, water regulation artifacts, terraces, embankments, alignment trees, forests, as well as roads and agricultural buildings"* as some of the tangible traces and agricultural techniques, as signs of intangible living heritage.

Similarly, heritage conservation – comprising both preservation and appropriate utilization – has played an increasingly important role in China's urban development as a cornerstone for enhancing cultural confidence since 2016. Beijing has developed detailed policy and supporting documentation in this regard as the city strives to build a national cultural centre city. Culture and heritage also play a prominent role in Kraków's Development Strategy. This is where I want to live. Kraków 2030 (Municipality of Kraków 2018) is framed by the vision of Kraków as a modern metropolis, vibrant with culture, open, rich, safe and friendly, proud of its historical heritage, co-created by the inhabitants. It also envisages the city leading in relation to fulfillment of symbolic functions, being a depository of heritage and national identity, and being the most recognisable Polish city in the world.

c) How are future generations involved in transforming their ancestor's historical place into heritage?

Future generations are generally inadequately, if at all, involved in transforming their ancestors' historical places into heritage. For example, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality's priority policies include 'Living heritage', 'Unique heritage', 'Inclusive heritage' and 'Egalitarian heritage', which are pursued by creating and developing Istanbul's tangible and intangible cultural heritage inventory, collections, and presenting it to the public with educational and informative research activities. While the foci relate predominantly to physical heritage, the principal idea is that cultural heritage must be preserved and go beyond physical reinforcement so that they can be passed on to future generations. However, there is little evidence of children and young people being actively involved in these processes. By contrast, Beijing has recently deliberately sought to do just that and is therefore something of an exception: science courses, visits, and variety shows about the Central Axis have been designed, and related content are absorbing into educational scheme or textbooks. The Cultural Creation Competition about the Central Axis held in 2022 involved many young people – interesting them in historical and cultural conservation.

d) What are the alternatives to cope with future risk relevant to heritage management in the metropolis?

Particularly because of high built densities and old buildings, extreme events and disasters like earthquakes, fire outbreaks and flooding turn hazards into high risks in some metropolises. Fire risk is particularly relevant where numerous and important heritage sites and assets comprise ancient wooden buildings, as in Beijing and Seoul. These and other risks are addressed by means of two complementary coping

strategies: building more efficient daily monitoring and regular evaluation system, which could improve the capacity of preventive conservation, and strengthening urban resilience through formulating related planning and interventions to provide a safe environment for heritage assets. Preservation of assets and their adaptive reuse prevent degradation and loss of urban historic structures. The roads that connect the different cities of the metropolis and to other cities in the country represent a form of heritage in Tel Aviv. They link the city with the open areas, the agricultural territories, different historic time layers and evolution of cities. Social participation contributes to public cultural policies, which are underpinned by various studies contributing to the city's overall resilience strategy.

e) How could heritage become a game changer or a driver for improving quality of urban life?

It seems that heritage has the power to accelerate the achievement of the wellbeing of the people in the metropolis. It helps to achieve the wellbeing of the planet, especially through an integrated culture–nature approach and landscape-based solutions and fosters social cohesion and dialogue to accomplish peace within and among societies. But this possible trend should be explored further. At any rate, looking at heritage in the metropolitan context will change the way to understand both heritage and the metropolis. In New York, heritage preservation plays a role in some traditional "quality of life" metrics, most notably job and small business opportunities driven by tourism. However, the largest role heritage preservation plays are harder to quantify – a sense of civic pride, and joy in the city and sense of community.

But there are metropolises such as Moscow, where the demand for heritage preservation, in contrast to housing and infrastructure, is not sufficiently strong to be gain attention. Only small groups of townspeople in the public space are concerned about heritage. In other metropolises, like Tel Aviv, heritage is becoming an important factor in the metropolitan economy, particularly linked to further development and promotion of tourism.

The great challenge is to propose a framework of tools (a toolbox) in relation to the protection of the landscape understood with the holistic view of heritage. There is the need to reconceptualize heritage and understand it as an evolutionary concept, the need to rethink the scope of the general protection of the Historic Protection Areas, the need to incorporate the natural landscape as an essential part of the heritage as well as the need to introduce the protection of visuals as another key dimension. In this regard, the example of Beijing is worth highlighting:

> *… rational use and adaption to contemporary life are crucial for heritage transmission. ...It is important to make tangible heritage accessible, to understand its construction concept and skills, and to feel the space it creates… Intangible cultural heritage, besides recording its history and skills in their original form, must also be adapted to contemporary values and aesthetics in order to have longevity. For example, the small animal clay sculptures originally used for rituals are transformed into dolls for children, and their forms, colours and materials are also borrowed from today's cartoon figures. In other words, only when heritage conservation is integrated into daily life, its greatest value can be present. We should constantly absorb new elements into traditional culture, and transform some outdated parts, to make the city more colourful (Beijing Report, 2022).*

f) How can heritage policies be better associated with long term spatial and economic planning?

Right now, heritage policies are commonly not well associated with long-term spatial and economic planning. In New York, physical heritage is well integrated but the city team point out the difficulty of maintaining flexibility and vibrancy needed to preserve different categories of heritage while subjecting it to long-term planning. As elsewhere, however, culture is not given a central role in relation to planning and policy making. In most cities, tax reliefs and specific lines of credit and bank financing for residents in heritage preservation areas and listed properties – as in Rio de Janeiro – are often lacking or inadequate. Various communities in a multi-metropolitan structure should benefit more from heritage. Heritage is a very important form of 'capital' and should be a support towards achieving sustainable development. Public-private partnerships in the conservation and management of heritage should be promoted.

Because of the characteristic of governmental administrative system, Beijing's heritage policy is better reflected in spatial and economic planning than in most of the cities covered by this report. On the one hand, the government incorporates the tasks and funding arrangements related to heritage conservation into the national economic development plan, so as to support relevant works with the government's decision-making and work arrangement. On the other hand, the spatial requirements for heritage conservation are strictly incorporated into the corresponding levels of spatial planning. For instance, the conservation planning of the historic city of Beijing is being incorporated into the Beijing master plan, and the conservation planning of a historic and cultural area into the detailed plan of the corresponding areas. By incorporating conservation planning into spatial planning and implementation plan at all levels, the transmission of heritage policies and associated requirements can be achieved.

An important innovation in the Greater Shanghai Metropolitan Area was the launch on 9 October 2021 of Planning and Construction Guidelines for the Pilot Zone of the Yangtze River Delta Ecological Green Integrated Development Demonstration Zone. This is the first cross-provincial planning and construction zone in China, encompassing 660 km2 of early start-up area, with possible subsequent expansion to the entire 2,413 km2. Construction of the demonstration zone must aim for integration and high quality, highlighting ecological and green development. Focusing on ecology and environment, urban design and integrated transport, the whole guideline will be promoted in steps, forming version 1.0. In conjunction with the study on 'metropolitan heritage', the sustainable development strategy of the demonstration zone includes four areas directly relevant to this study, namely rural conservation, historical and cultural conservation and utilization, ecological space and ecological landscape.

g) What are the foreseeable changes in the current governance and management frameworks of the metropolis in the medium and long term?

No significant change is foreseen in leading metropolises like New York and London, where the current frameworks have been in place for a considerable period – the 1960s and 2000 respectively. In economic hubs like Delhi and Moscow, culture is not at the centre but nevertheless the quality of their historical urban landscapes and urban life in different parts of the metropolises have been changing and improving; in Rio de Janeiro this is not the case. At this time, the municipality there is focusing on maintaining the existing structures.

By contrast, Beijing is deepening its urban management mechanisms towards the grassroots and subdistrict offices designed to achieve this are playing an increasing role in urban governance, including through having planners based there. At the same time, the channels of public participation are being expanded, enriching the forms of participation and forming a collaborative governance mechanism of co-construction, co-governance and sharing by allowing the public to participate extensively in urban governance. It is intended as an effective complement to top-down policy approaches.

In metropolitan Shanghai, in response to the problems of mismatched functions, unco-ordinated space, and unrefined management resulting from unco-ordinated standards in Shanghai, Jiangsu and Zhejiang, the current standards in Qingpu, Wujiang and Jiashan will be studied and optimised on the basis of practical experience of cross-border construction around the world. Unified technical standards of 660 km2 in the early start-up area of the Yangtze River Integrated Demonstration Zone outlined in the previous subsection will be determined to help construct a unified spatial pattern.

In Tel Aviv there are metropolitan strategies for multi-centres, infrastructure, housing and employment. A new notion of heritage in a multi-layered way is in the making.

And in the Milan metropolitan case, the metropolitan authority plays a co-ordinating and guiding role within the field of conservation and preservation of natural and ecosystem heritage: In the metropolitan plan, heritage of the Metropolitan City of Milan and its territory is extremely complex in its components and extremely rich and in need of further development. The Metropolitan City of Milan is already putting into action advanced process and tools for planning operationally for monitoring and evaluating the natural and cultural heritage of the metropolis.

There will be an important challenge to generate a more comprehensive and holistic metropolitan approach and a new body of heritage tools (legal, management). The theoretical and methodological conception of heritage must evolve, as well as heritage itself.

5. Conclusions

This analysis has revealed many features and processes distinctive to individual metropolises, as well as great diversity. Nevertheless, there is also some scope for generalization within this sample. In terms of governance, the older metropolises in high-income countries tend to have long-established structures and significant responsibilities with respect to heritage, most often natural heritage, although principally at the strategic level. Many powers and responsibilities, especially for cultural heritage, actually lie with the respective municipalities, boroughs or urban districts that make up the metropolis, and also with a range of other agencies and institutions straddling the public, private and NGO/civil society sectors. London and Paris exemplify such situations, although in Barcelona, Istanbul, New York, Beijing and Shanghai the strategic powers are metropolitan. Even so, exceptions exist, with Moscow metropolis having no overall heritage plan, although it reports annually on cultural heritage. Conversely, Seoul has a well-established and resourced metropolitan government and some of the most comprehensive integrated heritage roles and responsibilities anywhere. The situation is also diverse in middle- and lower-income countries. Whether a metropolis also serves as the national capital may be significant in terms of investment in national symbols and historical heritage. In this sample, Barcelona, Istanbul, Kraków, Milano, New York, Shanghai, Rio de Janeiro and Tel Aviv are not current capital cities, although Rio held that status until the inauguration of Brasilia in 1960.

Overall, probably the most important issue relates to the nature and appropriateness of the division of powers, responsibilities and resources for natural and cultural heritage among national, regional/provincial and local government in each country. Within local government, the metropolitan authority commonly has a strategic role, although more often with respect to natural than cultural, and tangible than intangible, heritage. Beijing, Buenos Aires, Istanbul, Kraków and Seoul attach distinctive priority to cultural heritage. The main powers and responsibilities lie with the individual municipalities, boroughs or urban districts and with the other categories of organisation mentioned above, rather than with the metropolitan authority. There is also great diversity among the respective municipalities within a metropolis, with the core city being far better resourced and having more developed heritage interests, roles and capacities than more recently established and suburban or peripheral municipalities. The Autonomous City of Buenos Aires and Tel Aviv municipality illustrate this particularly well within their respective metropolitan areas.

In those cities with longstanding heritage policies and appropriate staff capacities and resources, policies have generally progressed from a focus on individual monuments and sites to more integrated, area-based conservation approaches that combine natural and cultural heritage assets and seek to utilize rather than just preserve them.

Other key conclusions are that, notwithstanding decades of action by UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICCROM and other international bodies, as well as dedicated work nationally and locally, most metropolises and their constituent local government entities together do not possess adequately integrated, coherent and resourced cultural and natural heritage policies and programmes.

Moreover, the existing heritage regimes are more often backward looking rather than forward looking, concerned with preservation of monuments, sites and distinctive heritage neighbourhoods, or ensuring that museums and heritage parks are well visited, rather than engaging adequately with ensuring that heritage as a whole plays a key part in metropolitan sustainability and resilience strategies.

The evidence provided by this survey and initial comparative analysis suggests that there is a strong need for the Heritopolis initiative and that there is considerable potential to enhance the role of the metropolis in integrating heritage more appropriately into forward-looking sustainability and resilience strategies. While there is much work to do across many dimensions as Heritopolis moves forward, this report concludes by drawing attention to two issues arising from the survey findings and which require thoughtful attention.

The question of how, if at all, indigenous/traditional cultural sites and monuments, events, rituals and other practices are included within the metropolitan approach to heritage actually raises one key challenge that merits problematisation and investigation later in the Heritopolis programme. This is how indigeneity and 'tradition' are understood and codified in the respective metropolitan and national contexts. In situations of relative ethnic and cultural homogeneity, e.g., Seoul, this may be fairly unproblematic, referring to different historical periods and technologies. In multicultural, culturally and ethnically diverse and socio-economically unequal contexts, however, particularly where imperial or colonial histories and other sources of structural inequality are implicated, the issues may be complex, sensitive and conflictual. While differing in nature, extent, balance and cultural 'style', this applies both to former imperial and colonial capitals like London, Paris and Moscow, and former colonial cities like Buenos Aires, New York, Rio de Janeiro and Delhi – in the last-mentioned case also with an indigenous pre-imperial urban history. Different blends of these issues also apply in Milano and Tel Aviv.

Tangible assets like physical monuments, sites and green open spaces are generally better covered by existing laws, ordinances and regulations than intangible heritage assets. Official histories, monuments and heritage policies often reflect the dominant interests in each metropolis, defined historically, geographically, socio-economically, ethno-culturally and often politically. Echoing the key point from the previous paragraph, the importance of inclusive policies and programmes to ensure that the interests and priorities of minorities and marginalised or excluded groups are integrated are gaining recognition but this remains far from universal or substantive in implementation. Becoming more inclusive will be instrumental in gaining trust and 'buy-in' from such marginal(ised) groups as part of metropolitan sustainability and resilience strategies. Such inclusivity will, in turn, be important in how awareness of, and pride in, heritage contributes to the ethos and spirit of each metropolis, perhaps expressed as the essence of being bonaerenses, Londoners or Parisians, or of Milanesity, for instance.

One other important focus will be on how the metropolis 'fits' institutionally with a larger and more functional approach based around natural bioregions, watersheds or river basins rather than politico-administrative boundaries. This city-regional perspective is gaining attention in terms of nature-based solutions, natural capital, ecosystem services and other approaches as underpinnings for sustainability and resilience strategies. This will also introduce additional complexity since some such areas are classified as rural, with different land-uses and administrative authorities. Dedicated lead institutions, such as l'Institut Paris Region, may therefore be needed.

Annex. Road Map of Metropolitan Heritage to 2024 and Beyond as Part of the Decade of Action

• The Heritopolis UNI consortium will provide evidence and momentum to support metropolitan cultural and natural heritage as a vital component of implementation of the New Urban Agenda, thereby also boosting progress towards achieving the SDGs.

• Heritopolis will promote regular research forum meetings identifying cross-cutting subjects and providing new actions across participating cities.

• Provide consistent data for the periodic follow-up and review by Countries of the New Urban Agenda.

• Support Countries in their Voluntary National and Local Reviews reporting; coordinate Knowledge Management; support Data Analytics, Learning and Capacity Development through research and practice, engagement and participation.

• Hold an annual debate on World Metropolitan Day in October and leading up to the Twelve Session of the World Urban Forum (WUF 12) to be held in Cairo in 2024.

A full list of the metropolises and the respective universities participating in Heritopolis can be found on our website *www.heritopolis.org.* In order to benefit from the widest possible range of metropolitan experiences, we invite additional metropolises to join Heritopolis. Details on how to do so are provided at *http://heritopolis.org/research-idea-notes/?uid=27&mod=document&pageid=1*

Metropolitan Heritage – Heritopolis
The Metropolis as a Heritage – The heritage that shapes the metropolis

UN-Habitat UNI
Consortium on
Metropolitan Heritage

Heritopolis Society
Science Building(210), 120, Neungdong-ro, Gwangjin-gu
Seoul, Republic of Korea
www.heritopolis.org

heritopolis@heritopolis.org