

Ilisu HEP CoE

300833.01
June 30, 2009

Ilisu Hydropower Project, Turkey

Report of the Sub-Committee on Cultural Heritage

Forth Site Visit May 18-23, 2009

Report Prepared on Behalf of
Euler Hermes (Germany), OeKB (Austria) and SERV (Switzerland)

Contact:

Dr. Margarete van Ess
CoE Chairperson
e-mail orient@dainst.de

Contents

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONSIII

EXECUTIVE SUMMARYA

1. Purpose of the site visitA

2. Important achievementsA

2.1. Information and documentation for CoE-CH (Reference: TOR-CH 1 and 2).....A

2.2. PIU staff (Reference: FAM Annex 1.2).....B

2.3. Surveys (Reference TOR-CH 1, 8)B

2.4. Cultural Heritage Action Plan (Ref. TOR-CH 2).....C

2.5. Preservation of the cultural heritage of Hasankeyf (Ref. TOR-CH 1, 2, 4, 10-12)C

3. Priority activities with regard to TORsD

4. SummaryH

REPORT ON THE FORTH SITE VISIT..... 10

1 INTRODUCTION..... 10

1.1 General remarks 10

1.2 Schedule of the Forth Site Visit 11

2 FIELD OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 12

2.1. Issues related to FAM protocol and PIU 12

2.1.1 PIU Staff..... 12

2.2 Issues related to TOR-CHs..... 13

2.2.1. TOR-CH 1 13

2.2.2 TOR-CH 2 18

2.2.3 TOR-CH 3 20

2.2.4 TOR-CH 4 21

2.2.5 TOR-CH 5 24

2.2.6 TOR-CH 6 25

2.2.7 TOR-CH 7 25

2.2.8 TOR-CH 8 26

2.2.9 TOR-CH 9 28

2.2.10 TOR-CH 10 28

2.2.11 TOR-CH 11 29

2.2.12 TOR-CH 12 29

ANNEXES..... 37

A1 PHOTOS 38

List of Tables

Table 1-1: Schedule of the CoE-CH site visit.....	11
---	----

List of Figures

Photo 1: Excavations in Ilisu village	38
Photo 2: Excavations Ziviya Tivilki (close to the construction site).....	38
Photo 3: Protection of Boncuklu Field	38
Photo 4: Cultural heritage survey along the street Midyat - Dargeçit	39
Photo 5: Remains of a village at the street Midyat - Dargeçit.....	39
Photo 6: Remains of a village at the street Midyat – Dargeçit, cistern	39
Photo 7: Arcosole grave near the village at the Midyat – Dargeçit road.....	40

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CHAP	Cultural Heritage Action Plan
CoE	Committee of Experts
CoE-CH	Sub-Committee Cultural Heritage
DSI	Ministry of Water Resources
ECA	Export Credit Agencies
EIAR	Environmental Impact Assessment Report, as published on the website
FAM	Agreed Minutes of the Final Assessment Meeting regarding Ilisu Dam and Hydroelectric Power Plant Project
GAP	South Eastern Anatolia Project
MoCT	Ministry of Culture and Tourism
OeKB	Österreichische Kontrollbank Aktiengesellschaft, Wien
PAP	Project-Affected Person
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PIU-CH	Project Implementation Unit Cultural Heritage
TOR	Terms of References
WB	World Bank

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Purpose of the site visit

Between May 18th and 23rd, 2009 a forth site visit of the CoE-CH took place.

The main objectives of the work of the CoE were to evaluate:

1. Archaeological surveys: state of activities, adjustment to project necessities
Survey of monuments: state of organization of activities
Ethnographic surveys: state of organization of activities
2. Archaeological excavations:
scientific approach, planning of additional excavation sites,
administrative structures, budget requirements
3. Documentation of historical monuments:
Scientific approach, progress of activities, planning of future actions based on
the documentation
4. Ilisu construction site area:
State of ethnographical surveys
Progress of rescue excavations, planning of additional excavations
5. Hasankeyf: state of planning and assessment studies
Evaluation of documents and information regarding scientific approach,
international standards in concepts, conservation and presentation,
quality control,
6. Structure and activities of PIU-CH
Evaluation of the new structure of PIU-CH
State and discussion of the detailed Cultural Heritage Action Plan

2. Important achievements

2.1. Information and documentation for CoE-CH (Reference: TOR-CH 1 and 2)

Information about baseline data and planned activities within the scope of the CHAP has improved tremendously. All major studies for the collection of baseline data, pre-feasibility and feasibility studies have been started in the meantime. Results, however, cannot be completed before the end of the year 2009/beginning of 2010.

Completion of baseline data therefore is to be expected in the first half of 2010 and, based on this, completion of a realistic CHAP as well.

While collection of baseline data in the phase I area is nearly completed – with the exception of final, detailed ethnographic surveys in the area – other baseline data such as the technical methodology, the budget and the time planning for time consuming documentation, conservation, restoration of monuments in Hasankeyf are not. They are

pre-requisite for a proper evaluation of the preservation of cultural heritage within the Ilisu Hydropower Project. In this respect, the presentation of an overall cultural heritage concept for Hasankeyf according to the philosophical approaches of international conventions and standards, the technical proof for the possibility to preserve or to relocate and the realistic estimation of time and budget belongs to baseline data as well. They have to be available at least for some monuments before the start of construction work in order to serve as a basis for calculation of necessary activities.

2.2. PIU staff (Reference: FAM Annex 1.2)

PIU-CH has been re-structured since winter 2008/9. Activities, reporting and communication between the different parts of the project as well as to the CoE-CH has improved tremendously.

There still is an obvious lack of a senior specialist with long experience in cultural heritage projects who would be able to adjust the different, well and professionally organized single activities into one major concept according to international standards. In addition, a senior specialist trained as an architect with special focus on history of architecture and experienced in the conservation of partly destroyed historical monuments is missing. This specialist should be responsible for quality control of documentation at an early stage of work as well.

CoE-CH is not able yet to evaluate the kind of responsibilities or the work experience regarding large scale projects each member of PIU-CH has. CVs were presented for some members of ENCON as well as external cooperating scholars only.

2.3. Surveys (Reference TOR-CH 1, 8)

Surveys are the basis for all cultural management planning of the projects, and especially for the CHAP. The availability of their results is urgent, and especially for the Ilisu construction area very urgent. This is very well understood by PIU-CH. All necessary surveys were started in the meantime and a considerable number of urgent surveys have been completed. Completion of the rest is scheduled for end of 2009/beginning of 2010.

In phase I area nearly all urgent surveys have been completed. Still missing is a more detailed documentation of vernacular architecture and use of space in the phase I villages. It is very necessary to complete this kind of survey before the start of construction. In addition, archaeological surveys did not cover all areas affected in the construction site but only those which will be affected by construction work. The remaining surveys still have to be carried out.

A general ethnographic survey has been completed for the whole area affected by the dam. Now, more detailed surveys have to be carried out. Proposals for such surveys have been made. The proposals are, however, not approved yet by PIU-CH and the relevant decision taking bodies. After general approval, these more detailed surveys should be carried out as long-term studies. Except for the additional documentation of vernacular architecture in phase I villages there is no need to complete them immediately but taking into account the requested timing of TOR-CH 8 (one year

before start of construction work in the affected village or area or one year before start of impounding).

2.4. Cultural Heritage Action Plan (Ref. TOR-CH 2)

The CHAP has several aims: 1) presentation of concepts, time-schedules and budgets as a basis for further detailed planning. The concepts, time-schedules and budgets must be developed on realistic figures and therefore need pre-feasibility and feasibility studies for all major steps of cultural heritage activities. This kind of planning is the basis for all projects of this kind and scale. To fulfil this aim of the CHAP it has to be presented before the start of a project. 2) To provide all stakeholders of the project with the necessary information about the general framework of the project (legal, ethical, organisational basics), the timing of all works including the definition of milestones which have influence to other parts of the project as well, and the budget planning approved by the relevant authorities.

Completion of the CHAP will be only possible after completion of all archaeological, ethnographic and architectural surveys (TOR-CH 1, 8) as well as after completion of feasibility studies for the conservation etc. and relocation measures for monuments in Hasankeyf and the preliminary concepts for the presentation of Hasankeyf and museums and park concepts (TOR-CH 12).

CoE-CH therefore urgently asked for further information about pre-feasibility and feasibility studies since autumn 2007. Only few data were available to CoE-CH since that time and until end of 2008. In 2009 most of remaining, necessary studies were initialized by PIU-CH. Part of the results were presented in May and June 2009, other parts are to be expected by end of the year 2009/beginning 2010. While this foreseeable completion of studies is a very promising fact, one, on the other hand, has to face the reality that important information, especially on the proof of movability of monuments or the budget needed for that, will be available only in some months.

It is highly recommended to remind all parties that several TORs for Cultural Heritage and especially TOR-CH 1, 2 and 12 have to be completed before the start of construction work as shown by the requested dates for completion (April and September 2007).

2.5. Preservation of the cultural heritage of Hasankeyf (Ref. TOR-CH 1, 2, 4, 10-12)

The preservation of the cultural heritage of Hasankeyf remains one of the most demanding tasks of the Iisu Hydropower Project. It is not only the outstanding location and historical situation of Hasankeyf (“authenticity in setting”) which should be preserved as far as possible, but a large number of fragile architectural monuments as well. Special concepts had been requested by CoE-CH since 2007. In the meantime this is well understood by PIU-CH. Since winter 2008/9 proposals for general concepts, tourism concepts and concepts for a museum and the archaeological and cultural park respectively were initiated. While this has to be regarded as a huge step forward, the concepts themselves are in major parts in a very initial phase of work. In summary, baseline entry to the database for the monuments of the Lower Town of Hasankeyf has been finalized, documentation of two monuments regarding its present situation and regarding urgent measures for conservation have been presented and were approved by

the Regional Conservation Council. A very preliminary study of the geo-stability of local bedrock was presented but urgently needs further detailing and proposals for the conservation for specific monuments. Feasibility studies for the necessary restoration of monuments is under way, the technical study for movability of two monuments as well. Concepts for the museum, the cultural heritage park and the archaeological/open air park are in the very preliminary at the moment and mainly present possible theoretical approaches. This is an important first step but does not provide yet concepts which would be open for discussion or, reliable figures for budget and technical feasibility that would allow a proper preparation of a reliable CHAP. As soon as all mentioned feasibility studies are completed and available, CoE-CH will be able to provide concrete guidance as asked for in TOR-CH 12B. In general and as already mentioned in previous reports, CoE-CH considers the case of Hasankeyf as a highly complex one which needs international brainstorming, announcement and invitation to tenders. We therefore would like to repeat our proposal that PIU-CH will organize an international conference especially on the case of Hasankeyf.

3. Priority activities with regard to TORs

All above-mentioned important achievements are closely connected to the TOR-CH. Necessary activities will be repeated here with respect to the TORs.

TOR CH-1: On urgent request of CoE-CH the structure of the baseline database was revised and adjusted to general international standards. The collection of baseline data for archaeological sites will be completed end of the year 2009. The professional collection of baseline data regarding remains of historical monuments other than those in Hasankeyf still has to be improved. Most of the documentation, pre-feasibility and feasibility studies for the preservation and relocation of monuments in Hasankeyf has to be considered as baseline data as well since their availability is crucial for a realistic CHAP. Details will be given in discussion of TOR-CH 12. The data are the basis for the comprehensive CHAP (TOR CH-2).

TOR CH-2: A comprehensive Cultural Heritage Action Plan is prerequisite for professional coordination with all parties involved in the project. One of its main objectives is to correlate and coordinate activities according to the necessities of the time schedules and budgets of all parties. The CHAP is the result of comprehensive study and analysis of all available data, documents and feasibility studies. The definition of strategies and methodologies, technical feasibility studies and all kinds of prefeasibility studies regarding the planning of cultural heritage activities has to be integrated into the CHAP. As a concrete working instrument, in addition it serves as a proof of feasibility and an announcement of all the cultural heritage activities necessary for the project. **As requested by WB and expressed by the given deadlines for TOR CH-1 and 2, it has to be available before the start of construction work.** Of course, a CHAP always needs amendment and adjustment of detailed activities throughout the duration of project. It is, however, necessary to have all major activities and data ready for planning before the start of a project.

The CHAP as it has been developed since February 2009 is a huge step forward. Its formal structure still needs improvement and advise by a senior cultural heritage expert regarding international terminology and structured planning but already now offers information to the two major parts necessary for the project: A more general part

informs correctly about the legal and ethical framework, the methodologies applied to surveys, excavations and documentation of monuments and a more detailed part presenting the planning of a number of concrete surveys, excavations and documentation projects (for details see the complete report below). A final version of the detailed CHAP, however, is to be expected after completion of all surveys and feasibility studies (see TOR-CH 12 regarding this as well). In case all planned activities will be completed as scheduled, the CHAP could be completed during winter 2009/2010.

In some parts the CHAP needs detailed revision. Time-schedules and budget schedules, for instance, are sometimes severely differing (see for instance the planning for archaeological activities in phase I area) or difficult to evaluate due to the lack of information (the historical monuments Hasankeyf).

TOR CH-3: All institutions that have worked in the area as well as interested additional ones should be informed about the progress and provisions of the project. Reportedly this has been fulfilled in major parts. There is, however, still few information available to the CoE-CH which could be changed easily: All information should be announced publicly and the kind of support should be explained that will be offered to the teams willing to carry out excavations or documentation projects in the dam area. This should include universities with interest in historical architectural monuments as well.

TOR CH-4: The number of excavations has been increased since spring 2009. Until surveys have not been completed yet it is, however, not possible to finally determine the number of excavations and documentations of historical monuments that have to be documented.

For all on-going and already planned excavations and documentation projects availability of modern technical equipment, regular supply with the allocated budget and the regular use of geo-physical methods would help tremendously to speed up the necessary work.

Detailed documentation of historical monuments – other than those in Hasankeyf –, on the other hand has been neglected more or less in the whole reservoir area (bridges, khans, religious buildings, etc.) Documentation of these, usually rather bad preserved monuments can be best done by specialists and scholars from universities in Turkey as well as abroad. Announcement for such studies should be made as soon as possible.

TOR CH-5: A comprehensive structure about the workflow and reporting system for the chance find archaeologists had been presented in late autumn 2008. In addition, with letter B.16.0.KVM.0.12.01.00.222 0.4 – 79338 the General Directorate of Cultural Properties and Museums re-affirms that in accordance with TOR-CH 5 an archaeologist and a deputy will be in steady contact with the Construction Company and in case of chance finds will be in the construction area all the time.

For the time being this TOR can be considered as being fulfilled. Please note that final completion of the task is completion of construction work.

TOR CH-7: In spring 2009 information has been given about the nullification of articles 2 and 3 of the decree No. 717, dated 4. Oct. 2006, decided on 26. Nov. 2008 by the Council of State of the Republic of Turkey. As far as the CoE-CH are able to

evaluate (having no profound expertise in legal issues) this court decision stresses the fact that it is the Regional Conservation Councils who have the authority to decide and approve major cultural heritage activities, such as relocation. First evaluation does not give hints for a major consequence for TOR-CH 7 but legal papers that did not take into consideration the authority of the Regional Conservation Councils, most probably need to be re-issued. External juridical evaluation, however, of possible impact on the relocation of monuments in Hasankeyf should be asked for.

TOR CH-8: A general ethnographic survey in the reservoir area has been completed in the meantime. Most of the detailed survey in phase I area are completed as well. Missing is a more detailed documentation of vernacular architecture, the structural layout of the villages and the description of the use of space. This additional documentation should be carried out as soon as possible. It has to be completed before start of construction.

For the remaining part of the dam area additional detailed surveys have to be carried out, according to the TOR-CH 8 started “timely before start of construction work or start of impounding” and “finished one year before start of construction work in the affected village or area”. Proposals have been presented and wait for approval by PIU.

The reports on the ethnographic peculiarities of the region (as well tangible and intangible heritage) include several recommendations by the PAPs to be taken into consideration for the layout of new settlements and the use of space. Regarding the preservation of cultural heritage (holy aspects of cemeteries, special graves; preservation of tools, handicraft) these recommendations should find proven reflection in the CHAP as well as regarding use of space in discussions with TOKI. This does not only refer to Hasankeyf but especially to the proposals of the inhabitants of villages in all areas affected by the dam.

TOR-CH 10: Refers to the reporting about the planning of CH relocation and rebuilding. This includes reports on the state of feasibility studies and concepts as well. During the preparatory planning phase (i.e. planning of the project before start of work) this TOR is interconnected with TOR-CH 12.

For a summary of our recommendations see TOR-CH 12.

TOR-CH 12A: Several activities relevant for the development of concepts for the Cultural Heritage Park and the Archaeological Park in Hasankeyf have been defined in the meantime. They all are important for these concepts, and work on them has been started for nearly all of them. TOR-CH 12 is relevant for the preparation phase of the project and aims at presenting concepts that allow more detailed planning – as well regarding the overall ethical concepts and more detailed concepts for all steps that will play a role for the implementation of the project. Development of time-schedules, definition of milestones and a realistic (whereas still rough) planning of budget are other tasks for the fulfilment of this TOR. All data have to prove that they are based on documented facts. As typical for this kind of projects, in this state of work it is not enough to present general ideas as concepts. The concepts have to be completed before the start of construction work, in order to enable all stakeholders of the project to estimate necessary (organisational, scientific, political etc.) input and costs.

Several baseline studies contribute to the development of the concept:

1. Tourism concept: The concept is fully available in the meantime. It highlights the overwhelming dependence of the future income situation of New Hasankeyf on the cultural tourism. Tourism, however, is threatened by several and severe obstacles. On the basis of the feasibility analysis and the description of worst case scenarios, in addition, alternative concepts should be presented regarding the question what could be done if tourism fails as job opportunity.

2. General concept for Hasankeyf: Alternative scenarios taking the aspect of cultural heritage into account are not presented yet. Instead, statements about the financial background and legal situation (location with as much as possible land belonging to the treasury) have been repeated. All concepts that are under development now, after 4 years of planning, are forced to try to adjust ideas to this situation – in general not the best basis for cultural heritage preservation aspects and highly problematic if the project seeks to find international acceptance. Several approaches for a general concept have been started. They only can be completed if all basic data regarding conservation, restoration and relocation feasibility are available. The concept has to prove that it took into consideration all international conventions and ethic approaches that are relevant and that have been summarized by PIU-CH in the documents. The development of such a concept is – and especially in the case of Hasankeyf – a very challenging task that cannot and should not be dealt with in a small group like PIU-CH. Rather one should think about organizing a conference by inviting international experts and scholars. Aim of that conference would be to collect more information about other projects facing similar problems and, to organize a mutual brainstorming on the special case of Hasankeyf. In general, on the basis of the then available basic data all arguments should be re-discussed again – even the ones for the location of the Cultural Heritage Park.

3. Cultural Heritage Park Concept and Museum: The development of concepts for the Cultural Heritage Park is very preliminary at the moment. Concepts have to be specified as soon as possible. Without such specification decisions and approvals of plans for, for instance, the museum that anticipates not yet finalized concepts for the park are very premature and should be annulated and re-opened for discussion – preferably international discussion – again.

4. Archaeological Park Concept / Open Air museum: The concepts for the archaeological park and open air museum should be developed in close discussion and in reference to the overall concept for Hasankeyf. At the moment, this integrative type of approach is not really visible in the presented documents. It is, however, demanded by PIU-CH itself who should be encouraged to further work on this concept.

5. Geo-stability analysis: A general geological study is available in the meantime. It leaves some questions about the geo-stability of bedrock carrying the Upper town of Hasankeyf. Detailed geological studies should be started immediately in order to be able to develop realistic projects for the preservation of some of the important monuments. Similar to all other studies the question of budget and time-schedules for these activities should be evaluated as soon as possible, along with projects for geological analysis in detail that have to be carried out in close relation and discussion with the archaeologists involved in projects in the Upper town.

6. Documentation of historical monuments, analysis of urgent conservation measures: Documentation of two monuments has been presented in May 2009. Work has been

carried out in high quality and is approved by the Regional Conservation Council in the meantime. In late 2008 CoE-CH was alarmed by the lack of quality of several other examples of preliminary documentations. One should not forget that in a high number of cases documentation will be the last information about a monument that will be available after inundation. Quality of documentation, therefore, is most important for all works. Despite the fact that a quality control system has been described in the meantime it is highly recommended to insist that at least one of the architects/architectural historians forseen as members of PIU in the FAM should be a senior expert in his field, as requested by CoE-CH since the very beginning of the project. PIU-CH will integrate such a specialist (see document on quality control p. 6) in the near future.

7. Scientific analysis of historical monuments on the basis of the documentation: CoE-CH repeats its strong request for the integration of scientific analysis of the structure of architectural monuments. Together with the technical documentation this kind of analysis for most of the monuments will be the only information that will survive after inundation. Only now it can be started and integrated! We highly recommend to hire a senior specialist in architecture / history of architecture as a member of PIU-CH who is familiar with the international scientific discussion and approach in this field.

8. and 9. Feasibility studies for restoration as well as relocation of monuments: Both activities are one of the most important part of the development of the requested concept and urgently need completion and integration of their results into the general discussion of concepts for Hasankeyf. The presented preliminary reports are rather cautious regarding the feasibility of relocation of more than one monument and do not offer information on possible costs. Information at the moment is too limited for further evaluation.

TOR-CH 12B: CoE-CH provided guidance by strongly requesting an improvement of both, professionalism of PIU-CH and capacity building programs for PIU-CH members. In addition, it provided guidance by requesting the initialization of a high number of pre-feasibility and feasibility studies (mainly mentioned above in our remarks regarding TOR-CH 12A). More detailed guidance by the CoE-CH might be possible in the near future. This depends on the availability of documents which partly have been presented in the meantime. CoE-CH from the very beginning (see report on the first site visit) proposed to discuss general concepts, ethical approaches and different technical possibilities in a conference with invited international experts.

4. Summary

Contrary to the documents presented and the state of activities until late autumn 2008, in the meantime all major activities necessary for a realistic planning and organisation of cultural heritage preservation within the Ilisu Hydropower Project have been started and in some parts completed. If the same external teams, together with a PIU-CH that has been strengthened by further, senior experts, will be enabled to continue all projects and works, it seems possible that the basic data and concepts are available in some months (estimated for winter 2009/10). In order to be able to proceed and to complete work it is necessary that PIU-CH receives further support regarding budget and acknowledgement by the consortium and DSI.

It must, however, clearly be stated that the goals described in autumn 2008, necessary for a start of major construction work for the project, in major fields have not been reached yet. CoE-CH still is of the opinion that without a presentation, evaluation and setting into action of base line data, development of a CHAP, development of concepts and different feasibility studies for Hasankeyf the approach cannot be proven as realistic and a success of the Cultural Heritage part of the project cannot be guaranteed. Cultural Heritage activities need a lot of care and therefore time. As long as the project as a whole – including cultural heritage activities – cannot be considered as well scheduled and prepared, failure especially of our field cannot be excluded.

REPORT ON THE FORTH SITE VISIT

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 General remarks

The forth site visit of the CoE-CH aimed at discussing progress of cultural heritage activities on the basis of reports and documents presented by PIU. These reports and documents focus on activities that were requested as minimum activities in order to decide on future continuation of the project. In addition, evaluation of on-going cultural heritage field-work in the dam construction area of Ilisu as well as in Hasankeyf had been undertaken by a visit to the relevant sites.

The main objectives of the work of the CoE were to evaluate:

1. Archaeological surveys: state of activities, adjustment to project necessities
Survey of monuments: state of organization of activities
Ethnographic surveys: state of organization of activities
2. Archaeological excavations:
scientific approach, planning of additional excavation sites,
administrative structures, budget requirements
3. Documentation of historical monuments:
Scientific approach, progress of activities, planning of future actions based on
the documentation
4. Ilisu construction site area:
State of ethnographical surveys
Progress of rescue excavations, planning of additional excavations
5. Hasankeyf: state of planning and assessment studies
Evaluation of documents and information regarding scientific approach,
international standards in concepts, conservation and presentation,
quality control,
6. Structure and activities of PIU-CH
Evaluation of the new structure of PIU-CH
State and discussion of the detailed Cultural Heritage Action Plan

All mentioned cultural heritage issues were evaluated jointly, as every site or monument usually has several objectives which need the evaluation of each expert. The report is therefore to be understood also as a joint report. Again, we would like to emphasize the very harmonious and committed working approach of all members of the CoE, who share the same understanding of WB international standards.

The forth site visit was accompanied by several members of PIU-CH and the consortium as well as Dr. Karl Lenauer, OeKB, as an observer. We very much appreciate the input of all persons involved, the highly committed and enthusiastic atmosphere of all members of PIU-CH. We very much appreciated the excellent

organization of the site visit by PIU-CH and the consortium, and in particular by Mr Ertan Demirbaş who as a non-cultural heritage specialist devoted his precious time to understand better the goals and standards of the preservation of cultural heritage.

1.2 Schedule of the Forth Site Visit

The forth site visit of the CoE-CH was scheduled for May 18th to 23rd, 2009. The program was proposed and organized as follows:

Table 1-1: Schedule of the CoE-CH site visit

CoE / SC – CH Site Visit Program		
Date	Day	Activity
17-May-09	Sunday	Arrival in Ankara
18-May-09	Monday	Morning: Meeting DSI/PIU
		Afternoon: Flight Ankara – Diyarbakir
19-May-09	Tuesday	Morning: Hasankeyf: Meeting with archaeological survey teams
		Afternoon: Hasankeyf: discussion of documentation of two monuments, geo-stability analysis Visit to the information office of the project
20-May-09	Wednesday	Full day: Visit to the construction site in the Ilisu area Evening: Flight Mardin - Ankara
21-May-09	Thursday	Ankara: Discussion of Ethnographic Studies, Archaeological Studie, Tourism Concept Studies
22-May-09	Friday	Ankara: Discussion of Studies on Cultural Park Area, General Evaluation on Cultural Heritage Afternoon: Wrap up meeting with DSI/PIU
23-May-09	Saturday	CoE Meeting, Preparation of CoE Report
24-May-09	Sunday	Flight back

2 FIELD OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1. Issues related to FAM protocol and PIU

2.1.1 PIU Staff

Starting position:

In line with WB standards it was decided and stated in the FAM (FAM Annex 1.2) to create a PIU consisting of proper staff able to carry out the Ilisu Hydropower Project according to the WB standards. Experienced personnel from involved Turkish authorities and other sources are required. If necessary, PIU will employ personnel who can meet the requirements. Experience in major cultural heritage projects as well as good skills in English for the leading personnel within the PIU-CH are prerequisite because of the requested professional and pro-active nature of PIU (see our report on the first site visit 1.4.2).

During all former site visits CoE-CH had to state a lack of professionalism of major parts of PIU and a severe underestimation of the working time needed for the project. It therefore was recommended to re-structure PIU, clearly define and describe responsibilities of all personnel involved and to prove professionalism by presenting Curricula Vitae of all members of PIU. In autumn and winter 2008/2009 PIU-CH underwent a major re-structuring involving the consulting company ENCON for coordination and reporting services. The at the moment final structure of PIU-CH had been presented in May 2009 (CHAP Chapter 1 Pg. 9). In addition to the information about the new structure, in June 2009 CVs of part of the members of ENCON consultancy company as well as some involved, but external scholars were made available.

Evaluation: There still is no information about the professional background for all other members of PIU-CH. CoE-CH therefore is not able yet to evaluate the functionality of the body or to determine specific problems within PIU-CH. We only can guess that part of the structural problems which obviously are still immanent to the body have their source in the lack of experience in large international projects of some parts of PIU-CH.

Information about which member of PIU-CH is able to work full time for the project has not been given. Furthermore, larger numbers of personnel have been recruited from different departments of the MoCT and seems to remain subject to directives from higher levels and therefore are not free to develop activities in a primarily pro-active manner for the project. Local PIU staff is in the process of recruitment and will take over local organization in the future. CoE-CH does not have full information yet which person within PIU-CH will be responsible for which fields of activity. It is however, obvious that a senior specialist in conservation and history of architecture has not been recruited yet.

On the other hand, coordination of activities has tremendously improved, mainly through the involvement of professional, external services. Activities were undertaken in all fields necessary for the preparation of the project. Structures for the coordination

of local PIU and the central body in Ankara have been developed and most probably installed.

There is, however, still a lack of coordination especially in the case of pre-feasibility and feasibility studies and concepts for Hasankeyf as well as a lack of understanding about the nature of documentation that would fulfil the necessary scientific level of documentation of architectural monuments. CoE-CH therefore urgently suggested the recruitment of a senior specialist (architect) in history of architecture. This has been accepted by PIU-CH as a task to be undertaken in the near future.

2.1.2 Communication

Observation: Speed of communication has been improved tremendously. Email contact as well as the system of exchange of documents between all Turkish bodies involved as well as to CoE-CH is functioning. Approval of documents and delivery of official reports and documents, however, still is rather slow and will be one of the threats to the project.

Recommendation: The system of exchange of official reports and documents between the ECAs and PIU should be clarified.

If there is no possibility to fasten processes in the near future, all parties involved into the project in Turkey have to take into consideration slow processes of official approval of activities (for instance by regional councils or by ministries). Official approvals, even if necessary only for minor activities, should be defined as milestones in the CHAP and an information system should be installed in order to deliver information to all other stakeholders of the Ilisu Hydropower Project.

2.2 Issues related to TOR-CHs

2.2.1. TOR-CH 1

Item:	CHAP – part 1 baseline data
Task:	PIU will submit reliable baseline data regarding the finds in the RAP Annex C1 to C4, containing the name of the find, its position, basic information, an indication whether the find is fully affected, partly affected, or not affected, and which measures are to be taken.
Completion	April 30, 2007
Source:	World Bank Operation Manual OP 4.11 in general, and Ciphers 4,6,7 in particular

General

A Cultural Heritage Action Plan according to WB standards is prerequisite for any decision to be taken regarding the project. It therefore must be developed and presented

before the start of the project and it serves as the basis for all decisions on cultural heritage activities.

Baseline data are to be collected by the study and a compilation of already existing data (published, and unpublished but archived data) prepared, by providing documents and by initiating the additional collection of data if necessary. Collection of data in the cultural heritage sector means carrying out field surveys, i.e., general ones to get a first impression of how much time and effort might be necessary and, in a second step, more detailed ones. The latter are the basis for decisions on further activities; in the case of cultural heritage issues the decision on whether and which monument / site will be documented or excavated in detail, preserved on location, relocated, or only documented. For the special case of ethnographic surveys see Section 2.2.8.

Observations:

Baseline Database:

In fulfilment of one of the major requests by CoE, since winter 2008/9 a database structure for the entry of baseline data has been developed and presented. The database structure as it is in use now in general is in accordance to international standards. There are, however, some entries missing or misunderstandable that would add important additional information: 1) in entry 4.1. dimensions: this usually has been filled in only according to the length and width of a site, the important information about height of deposits is not mentioned. 2) There is no field referring to the results of former scientific assessment. The field of bibliography has been understood as a very general one. Entries usually only refer to the publications in general. The result for the user of the database is that he is forced to go back to all published articles and find out by himself whether the information is comprehensive or only a remark. The purpose of the database is not to collect data only but to save time for all users by offering as much as possible information about sites and findings. The database therefore urgently needs amendment for a field referring in detail to content of former research, internal numbering of former surveys and exact references in publications. 3) At the moment, informations about geoarchaeological data, i.e. the setting within the landscape, conditions of archaeological deposits and surface materials/features, signs of use of space by man etc. (production activities, water supply, use of land for agriculture, circulation like internal streets, regional interconnecting routes) are missing completely. Since the last two decennias approximately, this kind of information is international standard for archaeological surveys. Information could be gathered partly from satellite and air photographs but definitely need verification in the field. One should not forget that these surveys will be the last possibility to collect data about most of the area and the sites. The collection of data, therefore, has to be carried out as careful as possible and according to the most advanced methodologies.

Additional archaeological surveys have been carried out in several areas, both areas that were surveyed before and areas not yet surveyed. The data of the surveys carried out recently have been entered to the baseline database. Older data, however, for instance those of the surveys of G. Algaze or the TACDAM project have only been started to be filled into the database. Reportedly this is due to the fact that additional information regarding position and height have to be collected during the ongoing surveys.

Surveys:

Additional archaeological surveys have been carried out in several areas, both areas that were surveyed before and areas not yet surveyed. Special focus for additional surveys was laid on phase I areas. In addition, archaeological surveys were undertaken in the area between Bismil and the confluence with the Batman river, the Batman river where affected and part of the Botan valley (CHAP rev03_en page 18). All other surveys, mainly covering the 60% of the area that were not surveyed yet at all, either have been started or will be started and carried out in 2009. Archaeological surveys are partly depending on the agricultural seasons, since areas with dense vegetation are difficult to survey for archaeological remains. Surveys will be completed earliest in autumn/winter 2009/10.

Survey of historical monuments other than Hasankeyf:

Survey of historical, usually architectural monuments in the area affected by the dam reportedly will be carried out by the archaeological survey teams. Information is entered to the database for those areas which were surveyed recently. Obviously older data have not been entered yet, whereas easily available (see for instance CHAP_rev03_en Annex A.2.5 archaeological sites Diyarbakir province where information about the remains of the Roman bridge of Köprükoy are not mentioned in the database).

In other areas (see for instance CHAP_rev03_en Annex B.1.1 Monumental Architecture Database of Mardin-Şirnak sub-region), historical monuments were shortly described and entered to the database. This might be an example how all relevant historical monuments will be treated in the coming months.

One major remark for this part of the database has to be given: despite the fact that most of the described monuments are in a rather bad shape of preservation and most probably will not be subject to further conservation, preservation or relocation this should not apply to further documentation as well. The area affected by the Ilisu dam is one of the most important historical areas in history of Eastern Turkey: the Tigris for a considerable period of time served as a border between eastern and western empires. Bridges, traces of ancient roads, towers and other buildings typical for border territories but as well buildings serving for long-distance caravans and religious service are very important to highlight this historical situation. One therefore should not only judge on the argument of the state of preservation of monuments but organize a scientific documentation of these remains. This could be best done by those scholars coming from universities, both national and international who have been specialized on the topic already.

On the example of the Ilisu mill in Ilisu village (CHAP_rev03_en Annex B.1.1 page 5) one should focus on advanced quality of documentation: the drawing obviously were carried out by photogrammetry and not in the field. The mill therefore has not been documented at its left part because of a shrub disturbing the view on the masonry. In addition, the drawing is out of shape, perhaps due to incompetent copying to the database.

Special case of the Ilisu construction site:

Archaeological surveys – as well for palaeolithic and pre-historical/historical periods in the Ilisu construction site proper have been completed in 2008 and early 2009. Surveys in B-category areas such as the construction area for the enlargement and new route for the Midyat – Ilisu road have been completed in spring 2009 as well.

In general however, the archaeological and architectural survey for the phase I-areas cannot be considered as completed as the limits of the survey within the construction site only follow the immediately affected border of the construction area and not the area which will be affected by the water immediately after completion of phase I.

Special case of Hasankeyf:

Still, a major part of fundamental baseline information on the historical monuments of Hasankeyf is not available yet. This is partly due to availability of older baseline data, and partly because the necessary documentation and feasibility studies have not been carried out so far. In the meantime however, all monuments have been entered to the database with general data. Reportedly, the technical documentation of 13 monuments will be completed by autumn 2009.

As already mentioned in our report on the first site visit lack of baseline information in this case mainly refers to 1) comprehensive information on the state of excavation and/or cleaning of a monument, 2) the state of documentation of the architectural structures, its decors, etc., 3) the state of scientific analysis of the building history, the analysis of construction techniques, etc., 4) the state of assessment studies of damage, 5) proposals for the conservation and/or strengthening of monuments, plans for restoration, 6) information about the current legal status (who is entitled to work on which monument), 7) plans and feasibility studies for a relocation, 8) future plans for documentation and study of areas where monuments will be removed (Report 1st site visit, Annex A.2.4).

Baseline data on the example of two monuments were requested. Baseline data are available for the technical documentation of the buildings as well as for their urgent damage assessment. This is interconnected with an evaluation of necessary actions for urgent conservation measures, a basic action for a possible future preservation and maybe relocation. In addition, a feasibility study regarding technical ability, time schedule and budget for the preservation and relocation of those two monuments had been asked for. The latter will be available in winter 2009/10. This kind of data had to be defined as baseline data since they are prerequisite for further planning of activities, time schedules and budget, i.e. a basis for a realistic CHAP.

During our recent field visit we were able to evaluate the photogrammetric documentation of two monuments of Hasankeyf (Orta Kapı, Zeynel Bey Türbesi), carried out several years ago, but amended by recent investigations regarding damage assessment and proposals for necessary further actions. All drawings were prepared by a specialized company, are of high quality and in the meantime were approved by the Regional Conservation Council. They, however, are not yet studied according to the historical development of the buildings, i.e. are not evaluated by the excavators or a specialised scholar for building history yet. The documentation is an important first

step, the analysis regarding the construction of the buildings and their building history still have to follow.

Prefeasibility studies for the selection of a location for a future cultural heritage and archaeological park as well as basic studies on the geostability of bedrock or the movability of monuments also belong to baseline data and are relevant for a realistic CHAP. For details see TOR-CH 12.

General formal observations: The entry “recorder” in the database never should only offer the information “PIU” since this in the future will not allow to figure out who might have been responsible for the original documentation and who might be able to provide further information. The same is the case for the date of record: it is much easier to follow errors if a accurate date is given. Usually, this kind of databases are meant for internal use within the project and will be made public only partly. There is no need for hiding detailed information.

Recommendation:

Amendment of the database regarding the above mentioned technical entries as well as regarding additional geoarchaeological data should be given priority. The database is meant as a basis for further planning, as well organisational planning within the project and scientific planning regarding scholarly use of the database and the selection of sites for further archaeological or documentary research. The forms the surveyors are using in the field therefore must be the same and later changes should be avoided where ever possible.

A proper definition of the geographical limits of A-category and B-category areas is still missing. In steady exchange of data with the responsible ministries and the consortium this definition should be made and information given to the different survey teams as soon as possible. It is strongly recommended that B-category areas as defined by the World Bank should be included more generously into the surveys. The reason is that it is expected that the Ilisu Hydropower Project will have a great impact on B-category areas by initiating new construction of infrastructure (roads, canalization, etc.), new settlements, relocating agricultural activities, etc. The surveys will provide competency for future decisions for all bodies involved and will help to prepare the timely registration in the cadastre of sites worthy of future protection.

Historical monuments and especially historical architectural monuments should be treated with the same care as archaeological sites and further actions planned according to the historical value of these remains. Quality control of documentation should be adjusted immediately.

Special focus should be given to a fast completion of all baseline data for Hasankeyf.

2.2.2 TOR-CH 2

Item:	CHAP – part 2 time schedule and budgets
Task:	PIU will submit a comprehensive Cultural Heritage Action Plan for all archaeological investigations (surveys & excavations) in the affected Tigris Area and in Hasankeyf including time schedule, responsible personnel, budgets and comprehensive calculations of the costs including calculation of chance finds, and the working plan.
Completion	April 30, 2007
Source:	World Bank Operation Manual OP 4.11 in general, and Ciphers 4,6,7,9 in particular CHAP 3.1 page 14

General:

A comprehensive CHAP is derived after several steps of information gathering and other activities and usually consists of several parts (see WB OP 4.11 and OP 4.01). Its aim is to avoid or mitigate any adverse impacts on physical cultural resources.

As an introduction to the comprehensive CHAP, general measures may be defined in order to explain the strategy of planned cultural heritage activities. The general CHAP describes several steps necessary for comprehensive documentation and preservation of cultural heritage and makes them public. It defines the measures and regulations under which cultural heritage activities are to be carried out and specifies the conditions for institutions and companies interested in being involved in cultural heritage activities.

A detailed CHAP on the basis of baseline data prepares the schedule and financial background for each step necessary for the defined cultural heritage activities. It coordinates its requirements with the schedules of other parties of the project and defines milestones to be fulfilled before the project as a whole can be allowed to proceed. To be able to set up such a detailed CHAP, as much accurate information as possible is necessary about the needed time span for each step of each cultural heritage project.

According to WB standards the CHAP should be available **before the start of a project**. This is absolutely necessary before being able to coordinate all parties of a project and clarifying important milestones in advance for everybody.

Observations:

A third version of a **general CHAP** has been prepared and made available to CoE-CH in May 2009. This is a completely revised version, starting for the first time by an important summary of all legal and ethical frameworks the project is bound to. It explains the net of stakeholders, and in addition to an overview over the history of activities and research in the region offers the definition of methodologies to be applied

by all involved scholars and companies to projects within the scope of the Ilisu Hydropower Project. This is a huge step forward.

Some parts, however, have not been completed yet or are not fully sensible yet. The general CHAP, for instance, mixes general definitions of activities and preliminary reports about on-going or recently completed actions. Other parts are – compared to the above mentioned – extremely short. It seems, for instance, that not too much consideration has been spent yet to the problem of conservation of archaeological materials (p. 52) which actually is already or will become a major task in the near future. Most probably it will be time consuming and expensive to organize the “necessary measures”, tasks which are not yet included into the budget proposal. The same is the case with the publication of results (p. 53). This needs a number of personnel for editing, and a certain budget for the printing itself – costs which are not yet calculated.

For the more detailed CHAP, budget estimation and time-schedule for excavations and archaeological surveys are available whereas the basis for the given numbers are not explained. Budget estimation is not available for the documentation of historical and monumental architecture and will be only possible to determine after completion of a feasibility analysis of all necessary steps for two different monuments as proposed by the CoE-CH. This is to be expected for beginning of 2010.

Detailed observations: At the moment, CoE-CH cannot approve statements that the documentation of rural settlements or the documentation of vernacular architecture have been completed (p. 5). See remarks to TOR-CH 8. The same is the case for Hasankeyf, where documentation of architecture has not (!) been completed (p. 79).

Special case of Hasankeyf

For the several feasibility studies that are necessary for a proper planning of activities in Hasankeyf compare TOR-CH 12.

The CHAP offers a comprehensive description of the different steps necessary for the documentation and preservation of historical monuments. This means that structuring of work is on a good path which has to be considered as a major positive development initiated in winter 2008/9. For the planning of further activities in the framework of the CHAP several details should be taken into consideration: Only baseline entry into the database has been completed yet, not yet baseline documentation of monuments in Hasankeyf (p. 66, 79)! Planning for monuments in B-category area should not only comprise of necessary safeguarding and restoration but of detailed documentation as well – restoration is a major intervention to a monument which should have been documented before (p. 63/64)! Listing primary sources needs to mention the monument itself as one of the most important bearer of information (p. 93)!!

When discussing the figures of the budget estimation (p. 107) it was not possible to collect more information about the basis for the cost estimations (except in information that these are unit prices according to special formula). They partly seem to be extremely underestimated regarding time and complexity. This might be one reason for quality problems observed for the documentation of several monuments in November 2008.

Special case of Ilisu construction site

Part of the described steps for the organisation of excavations are especially focused on rescue excavations in phase I area. It is a little bit difficult to distinguish which proposals are valid for all excavations in the dam area, both excavation that have been carried out for a long time or are planned as long-term excavation and those excavations and soundings that have to work under special conditions of time pressure and organisation. For the phase I area, there is in addition, a not yet explained gap between the time schedule given until 2014 and the budget allocated until 2011 only.

Recommendations:

Still, it is necessary to urge all involved parties and companies to complete and, where necessary, to initiate feasibility studies for all relevant cultural heritage activities (see in more detail the interconnected TOR CH-12). They have to be the basis for a meticulous time and budget estimation as well as a complete compendium of necessary working steps as needed for a comprehensive Cultural Heritage Action Plan.

At least the english version of the CHAP in some parts still lacks professional structure and wording. It is highly recommended to integrate a senior Cultural Heritage Expert into PIU and to revise the CHAP before making it public.

Within the scope of the CHAP the treatment of historical monuments, especially of Hasankeyf, still need more consideration and careful planning. It is highly recommended not only to tender projects on the basis of the presented way of planning but to involve universities and specialized scholars as well. This very much would help to improve the approach and to implement developments in scientific and cultural heritage approaches of recent decennia. In addition, PIU-CH still lacks of a senior specialist in the history of architecture who, for instance, would help to re-consider the preparatory phase of all projects and would be able to accompany quality control for tendering processes.

Budget proposals for the documentation, preservation and relocation of monuments of Hasankeyf need to be re-worked as soon as the feasibility studies are available and on the discussion of quality needed for further steps of the project. As proposed by CoE-CH feasibility analysis at the moment is under process for two of the eight monuments officially proposed for relocation.

2.2.3 TOR-CH 3

Item:	CHAP – part 3 involved institutions
Task:	PIU will submit a list of all involved institutions (involved universities, etc.) and their responsibilities. PIU will organize that all groups are equally informed of the project and will offer to coordinate the national and international (actual and

	planned) projects in the area and the treatment of the results of the investigations.
Completion	April 30, 2007

Observation:

Since time is running short for the execution of excavations, documentation of cultural heritage, restoration of monuments, and relocation, it is highly recommended that all institutions already involved in cultural heritage projects affected by the reservoir be contacted and requested to continue their projects. The strategies for further advertisement of the project and information to international institutions have been defined in the draft general CHAP of 2008 and activities have been started to improve support for Turkish and foreign missions. Reportedly there will be a special conference in autumn 2009 to further attract missions and invite them to support the project. In contrary to earlier versions of the CHAP, there is, in the draft version of May 2009, no detailed information available about the logistic support and administrative handling of excavation and documentation projects for Turkish and foreign missions.

This should apply not only to archaeological excavations and documentation but for the documentation and scientific analysis of architectural monuments as well. At the moment, historical monuments, other than those in Hasankeyf, are rather neglected. Their documentation very much requires specialist scientific approach which can be provided only by scholars coming from scientific institutions but not by companies who are usually not informed about the scientific value without time-consuming, thorough study of earlier literature.

Recommendation:

All institutions that have worked in the area as well as interested additional ones should be informed about the progress and provisions of the project. This information has to be announced publicly and the kind of support explained that will be offered to the teams willing to carry out excavations or documentation projects. This should include universities with interest in historical architectural monuments as well. In addition, it is also highly recommended that all institutions be informed about the kind of support PIU and the Ilisu Hydropower Project is able to provide. This applies to national as well as international teams and should be announced publicly.

2.2.4 TOR-CH 4

Item:	CHAP – part 4 tumuli excavation organisation
Task:	PIU will submit a plan for the investigation and excavation of the tumuli in the reservoir area and for arranging that at all times at least 5-6 heads of excavation will be available.
Completion	April 30, 2007

Source:	RAP chapter 2, page 89ff.
----------------	---------------------------

General

Excavations are one method to uncover and analyze human settlement activities of long bygone periods. Usually archaeologists excavate archaeological remains now buried underground. The excavation of mounds is typical for the region of the Ilisu Hydropower Project.

There are, however, other historical structures and monuments to be analyzed by excavation as well: The documentation of historical buildings and monuments such as bridges, khans, religious monuments and other structures whose upstanding structures are still visible quite often requires the careful cleaning and/or excavation of their lower part of structures and foundations. This requires a team of relevant experts and a certain number of involved workmen.

Observations:

Evaluation of on-going excavations were not the aim of this site visit. With this report we focus on more general, structural observations. The number of excavations has been increased since spring 2009. Until surveys have not been completed yet it is, however, not possible to finally determine the number of excavations and documentations of historical monuments that have to be documented. In order to preserve an accurate picture of the historical value of the region most probably excavations and soundings at additional sites will be necessary.

At the moment, reportedly several local centres are in preparation which will serve as supporting points for all cultural heritage actions in the affected area (CHAP Pg. 47). Activities have been started only recently and information on this positive development is still scarce.

Very drastic and not very helpful is the statement that A-category sites will be excavated in three years while B-category sites can be excavated in seven years (CHAP pg. 50). According to oral discussion this refers to the phase I area sites only. The statement should, however, be taken as one of the several examples where the CHAP needs urgent revision.

The documentation of historical monuments has – beside the research done in Hasankeyf – not been started yet in the reservoir area. This seems to be due to the fact that the necessity and methodologies of this kind of documentation work are not well understood yet. At the moment, these monuments find entry into the baseline database when recorded through the surveys. Usually, however, their rather poor state of preservation did not find the interest of the surveyors. So, regularly, “no further action” was recommended. This contradicts the importance of several kinds of monuments (bridges, towers, khans etc.) which have a special meaning in this border land between important historical empires. Even if their heavily destroyed structures deserve no further action regarding restoration or relocation thorough documentation by specialized scholars is highly recommended.

Special case of Hasankeyf

In addition to the observations given in our report on the first and second site visit which are still valid, one has to stress the fact again that geophysical prospection in addition to the excavations would perfectly help to document the town. From the CHAP it is obvious that such methods are planned to be applied but in the same time it is very obvious that PIU-CH is not aware yet about the detailed possibilities of the different technologies yet.

Some detailed observations: The documentation of architecture unearthed during excavations cannot be considered as finally documented. Examples presented to CoE-CH still show a considerable lack of quality. PIU-CH is aware of this problem and states in the CHAP Annex B.2.1 page 9 that measured drawings are planned. One should keep in mind, however, that it becomes very difficult to properly document architectural (and archaeological) structures after years of exposure to the air or after conservation (and therefore modern alteration) of the structures. One should remind all directors of excavation that documentation is the most important task which has to be undertaken during or immediately after excavation, by specialised professionals.

In addition, see the remark in CHAP, Annex A.3.2 p. 61: does documentation of vernacular and monumental architecture in Hasankeyf by filming substitute georeferenced documentation by drawing etc.?

Special case of Ilisu construction site

Excavations in Ilisu village and Ziviya Tivilki have been started in spring 2009. Excavations in at least two other sites are planned for this year. The planning of these rescue excavations are on a good path. Additional, modern technical equipment and support for the documentation of architecture and the excavation sites would offer tremendous help to the teams to speed up their work.

Recommendations:

Excavations and documentation of monuments in general

Still, a definition of criteria according to international standards for the selection of sites and architectural structures to be excavated or documented should be developed and presented. The current selection still is very much focused to rather formalistic criteria and less to scientific ones taking the historical situation of the region into consideration.

On the basis of these criteria detailed documentation of historical monuments in the whole reservoir area (bridges, khans, religious buildings, etc.) should be announced and started as soon as possible. We recommend to contact universities with specialisation in history of architecture or history of technical developments. Most of the historical monuments of the affected area are in a rather poor state of preservation and can be only understood in its historical value by scholars specialized in historical monuments.

On the basis of the hopefully soon completed surveys the number of excavations and documentations still should increase. The focus should be on A-category sites. While research at B-category sites is necessary for the historical understanding of the region as well and therefore should not be excluded, it cannot serve as a substitute for the

necessary research at A-category sites. The number of excavations in the construction site, however, should be increased to a high number as possible, since it is obvious that even B-category sites in the construction area for security reasons will be difficult or impossible to access during and after construction. Excavations take time; most of them will need a minimum of three years, but rather five to seven years on average. Unexpected findings and archaeological surprises of high historic importance cannot be excluded and have to be taken into consideration when planning time schedules. Teams, both national and international, that are interested in participating in the project should receive a well defined, published information about the support, the Ilisu Hydropower Project can offer. This could be part of the CHAP or given as a separate information and should include information about the possibility of centralized service for detailed topographical maps of the region, geological maps, satellite imagery, geophysical prospecting services, documentation by photogrammetry, aerial photography for documentation of monuments and excavation areas, etc.

The observations in the special cases of Hasankeyf and Ilisu construction site should be analyzed in all details in order to improve support for excavations and documentation projects in general: availability of modern technical equipment, regular supply with the allocated budget and the regular use of geo-physical methods such as such as magnetic gradiometer prospection, geo-electric and geo-radar area surveys or, in case of expected architectural remains the use of geo-electric profiles.

2.2.5 TOR-CH 5

Item:	Chance finds and archaeological expert
Task:	PIU will arrange that an archaeological expert as permanent contact person including deputy whom the construction company can contact whenever they discover chance finds and who is part of the PIU will be available all the time during construction work.
Completion	With completion of construction work
Source:	World Bank Operation Manual OP 4.11 in general, and Cipher 9 in particular

Observations:

A comprehensive structure about the workflow and reporting system for the chance find archaeologists had been presented in late autumn 2008 and included into the CHAP delivered in May 2009 again (p. 58 – 60). In addition, with letter B.16.0.KVM.0.12.01.00.222 0.4 – 79338 the General Directorate of Cultural Properties and Museums affirms that in accordance with TOR-CH 5 an archaeologist and a deputy will be in steady contact with the Construction Company and in case of chance finds will be in the construction area all the time.

In the meantime the archaeologists were in the area and received training by field archaeologists working in excavations. CVs and information about work experience, however, is not available for CoE-CH.

Recommendations:

The structure for the work-flow presented to CoE-CH has been approved. At the moment, the system seems to work. CoE-CH, however, was not able yet to evaluate the reporting system and proposes to get information on that on a regular basis (two times a year). Evaluation will be a task of a future site visit.

For the time being this TOR can be considered as being fulfilled. Please note that final completion of the task is completion of construction work.

2.2.6 TOR-CH 6

Item:	Income restoration
Task:	PIU will prove that a minimum of 50% of the workers needed for cultural heritage related tasks are recruited from PAPs.
Completion	Quarterly reports after until completion of Cultural Heritage related work
Source:	World Bank Operation Manual OP 4.12 in general; formal confirmation from Prof. Dr. Eroğlu to the ECAs dated July 21, 2006, page 3

Ordinarily, in cultural heritage activities this requirement for workmen is fulfilled. Lists of recruited PAPs for the excavations in the Ilisu construction site have been presented in May 2009.

Recommendation:

PIU-CH should make sure that the recruitment of PAPs has been documented for all excavations in the Ilisu dam area and can be presented to the ECAs at any time.

2.2.7 TOR-CH 7

Item:	Legal basis for relocation of monuments
Task:	PIU will provide the written confirmation by the Turkish Ministry of Culture or by the relevant authorities that the

	Ministry or the authorities agree to transport the affected monuments to the new Cultural Park. PIU will prove that the legal basis for the relocation is settled.
Completion	Before final commitment
Source:	World Bank Operation Manual OP 4.11 in general, and Ciphers 3,9 in particular

Fulfilled by document B.16.0.KVM.0.11.13.00/209379 of 20 Dec. 2006.

Recommendation:

In spring 2009 information has been given about the nullification of articles 2 and 3 of the decree No. 717, dated 4. Oct. 2006, decided on 26. Nov. 2008 by the Council of State of the Republic of Turkey. As far as the CoE-CH is able to evaluate (having no profound expertise in legal issues) this court decision stresses the fact that it is the Regional Conservation Councils who have the authority to decide and approve major cultural heritage activities, such as relocation. First evaluation does not give hints for a major consequence for TOR-CH 7 but legal papers that did not take into consideration the authority of the Regional Conservation Councils, most probably need to be re-issued. External juridical evaluation, however, of possible impact on the relocation of monuments in Hasankeyf should be asked for.

2.2.8 TOR-CH 8

Item:	Ethnographic studies
Task:	PIU will submit complementary ethnographic studies as recommended in the EIAR. PIU will conduct interviews with the population and will prepare a documentation (photographs, etc.) of the villages and houses to ensure that the history of the villages and the stories of the people will not be forgotten.
Completion	Finished one year before start of construction work in the affected village or area or one year before start of impounding
Source:	EIAR (Environmental Impact Assessment Report: chapter 5, page 6)
Commencement:	Timely before start of construction work or start of impounding

General:

Most parts of ethnographical surveys only make sense as long as a society remains intact. They have to be carried out before the start of major alterations to a region. The deadline for the TOR-CH therefore has been defined as to be completed one year before the start of construction work in the affected village or area.

Observation:

A general ethnographical survey has been carried out in all those villages affected by the dam that are still inhabited by an intact society. The relevant report has been presented in May 2009 and has been approved by CoE-CH. In addition, recommendation for more detailed surveys for some villages in the affected area have been delivered. Furthermore, more detailed ethnographic surveys have been carried out in phase I villages. The latter are not completed yet regarding vernacular architecture and the documentation of the structural use of space of the villages.

CoE-CH had asked that PAP should be consulted on affected cultural assets to be safeguarded in their view. Furthermore, CoE-CH had asked to present decisions how consultation of PAPs will be implemented into the project and how proposals will be taken into account by PIU. In addition to the reports about the ethnographical surveys CoE-CH received a document about the “consultation of PAP in Hasankeyf”. This focuses on Hasankeyf only, makes no relationship to the whole area affected by the dam and describes activities that are not implemented yet but might be a proposal for the future.

Recommendation:

All proposed, more detailed surveys should be carried out and should be considered as long term ethnographic surveys as usually requested by specialist in ethnography.

Additional documentation of vernacular architecture and the structures of the villages in the phase I area should be carried out immediately. Use of space in the villages should include use of land for agriculture and/or husbandry as well. Contrary to the statement in the document “Further ethnographical studies” gathering data with a GPS will be not sufficient. By using the satellite and/or aerial photographs a person should visit the villages again and define, describe and document open spaces, entrances to houses, location of tandooris etc.

The results and recommendations of the more general ethnographic survey should become part of the CHAP.

Construction work in the construction site area cannot be continued without completion, reporting and evaluation of the additional documentation of vernacular architecture and use of space in phase I area. According to TOR CH-8 all these studies have to be completed one year before start of construction.

The reports on the ethnographic tangible and intangible entities of the region include several recommendations by the PAPs to be taken into consideration for the layout of new settlements and the use of space and tools. Regarding the preservation of cultural

heritage (holy aspects of cemeteries, special graves; preservation of tools, handicraft) these recommendations should find reflection in the CHAP as well as regarding use of space in discussions with TOKI. This does not only refer to Hasankeyf but especially for the inhabitants of villages in all areas affected by the dam.

2.2.9 TOR-CH 9

Item:	CH Monitoring of survey and excavations in the Project Area
Task:	PIU will provide annual monitoring reports as well as a final report regarding the surveys and excavations in the project area.
Source:	World Bank Operation Manual OP 4.11 in general, and Cipher 9 in particular
Commencement:	one year after the start of the surveys and excavations in the project area, followed by annual reports
Completion	Completion of surveys and excavations in the project area

Constant task.

Information has been delivered for the excavations of 2008 and winter/spring 2009. Will be relevant again for a report in autumn 2009.

2.2.10 TOR-CH 10

Item:	CH Relocation and Rebuilding Monitoring
Task:	PIU will provide annual monitoring reports regarding planning of the relocation, relocation of the monuments, rebuilding and construction of the Cultural Park Area and the Archaeological Park & Open Museum Area.
Source:	World Bank Operation Manual OP 4.11 in general, and Cipher 9 in particular
Commencement:	Start of meetings and planning of relocation and rebuilding, followed by annual reports.
Completion	Completion of the Cultural Park Area and the Archaeological Park & Open Museum Areas

General:

This TOR-CH refers mainly to the special situation of historical monuments of Hasankeyf. However, it might be relevant for other historical monuments in the reservoir area as well, if surveys prove their importance for the history of the region. The list of monuments of the latter still has to be prepared by PIU-CH and presented for decision and approval to the entitled Turkish authorities as well as to the CoE-CH for evaluation.

Observations:

Meetings and planning of relocation and rebuilding were started a long time ago and have been intensified in the meantime for the preservation of monuments, for the relocation of selected monuments, and for the construction of a cultural park area close to Hasankeyf. Reporting about this planning is the task of this TOR. It will be mainly relevant as soon as activities will be carried out in the field but refers to the planning phase as well. The TOR therefore is highly interconnected to TOR-CH 12. We will present our observations within the discussion of TOR-CH 12.

2.2.11 TOR-CH 11

Item:	CH Cultural and Archaeological Park Monitoring
Task:	PIU will provide annual monitoring reports regarding the operation of the Cultural Park Area and the Archaeological Park & Open Museum Area (including numbers of visitors, acceptance by the affected population, feedback, effects on tourism in Hasankeyf and in the affected region, etc.)
Source:	World Bank Operation Manual OP 4.11 in general, and Cipher 9 in particular
Commencement:	opening of the parks
Completion	Full repayment of the ECA-covered loan

Not relevant before full operation of the planned areas.

2.2.12 TOR-CH 12

Item:	Park concept

Task:	PIU will plan the concept for the Cultural Park Area and the Archaeological Park & Open Museum Area in Hasankeyf. CoE will provide guidance to plan the concept for the Cultural Park Area and the Archaeological Park & Open Museum Area in Hasankeyf.
Source:	World Bank Operation Manual OP 4.11 in general, and Ciphers 4,8,9 in particular
Commencement:	As soon as possible
Completion	After final commitment, September 30, 2007

General:

Related to TOR-CH 10. TOR-CH 12, however, refers to the pre-planning phase which should have been finalized in September 2007. By this given data it is obvious that all tasks relevant for the fulfilment of this TOR are meant as pre-project planning phase. The early planning of concepts for the Cultural Park Area, the Archaeological Park and Open Museum area in Hasankeyf is necessary in order to provide a reliable basis for the discussion of the concepts, a reliable basis for budget and for time planning. Typical for a pre-project planning phase is that concepts have to be presented that will be approved at the end of this phase and will serve as a basis for all further detailed planning and – if necessary – for a decision on the feasibility of the whole project itself.

Observations:

End of 2008 a first, general concept for Hasankeyf had been made available. Since beginning of 2009 further prefeasibility and feasibility studies were initiated and either completed or brought on a good path.

In particular, these are:

1. Tourism feasibility analysis and concept development presented in May 2009, with amendment of worst case scenario presented in June 2009.

The study is a comprehensive and carefully made analysis which provides information and figures from all possible fields of interest. Several assumptions, however, are very much too optimistic or euphemistic. The concept refers to Hasankeyf as a site with special geographical features and cave dwellings, the valleys, ancient city etc. as prime qualification. Hasankeyf in this respect is compared with Göreme (p. 23). This describes the situation as it might be if there would be no change by the dam! The same is the case with the comparison of the town with Gaziantep and its museum: New Hasankeyf will be a completely modern town with no traditional features attractive to cultural tourists, and – at least at the moment – there are no such spectacular objects to be presented in the Hasankeyf museum as the mosaics under display in Gaziantep. Why should the relocated monuments be more attractive to tourists than the buildings in their original place (p. 21)? It is, therefore, not surprisingly but very realistic, if tour organizers are concerned about the survival of tourism following the inundation (p. 33). The figures given as possible increase of numbers of tourists seem not fully reliable to

us and only underline the very optimistic picture given in this report. Thus, it is very clear that all focus has to be laid on the preservation of as much as possible attractive monuments of Hasankeyf. Not only the park concepts but the museum itself has to be a highlight of the region. Success very much depends on the movability of not only one or two but a considerable number of monuments. The later delivered worst case scenario highlights what might happen, if the tourism concepts will not function. It, however, does not offer or even mention alternative scenarios.

2. Hasankeyf General Concept (see CHAP, Chapter 3) delivered in May 2009, in addition to Annex B.2 of the documents delivered for the EFN period in December 2008 and partly the document “Hasankeyf General concept plan” delivered in June 2009.

It is promising that the necessity of a general concept for Hasankeyf has been understood in the meantime. CoE-CH very much welcomes that a general concept has been initialized which develops a philosophical approach and integrates not only ethical aspects regarding the preservation of cultural heritage but in addition starts to present an integrative concept for whole Hasankeyf. Of course, all aspects – not only the theoretical ones, but organisational, technical and financial aspects as well – are densely connected to each other. Therefore, not only a separate definition and discussion of each aspect has to be developed but the integration of all aspects to one overall concept has to be undertaken. This not only takes time but needs a high number of specialists and senior cultural heritage experts.

At the moment all aspects which might or will have to contribute to such an overall concept have been raised by different experts and PIU-CH members. Discussion is still open and neither excludes ideas at the moment nor shows preference for one or the other possibility. Hopefully, this reflects not only the personal opinion of the team working on the document but of all PIU-CH. This means, in general, that people are in the state of studying and discussing the several approaches that have been developed all over the world and the philosophical and ethical considerations implemented in international projects. As stated by PIU (General Concept Plan pg. 46) requirements for a concept have been determined but still need some time to take all facts, arguments and feasibility studies into account and to integrate all stakeholders. Therefore, no definite connections to a possible concept for Hasankeyf and no fixed decisions are visible yet. Several alternatives have been shortly described for future decision that depend on the not yet available results from some of the feasibility studies. The problem is that without a more or less final concept it will be highly difficult to determine concrete actions and define necessary budgets. This is the reason why CoE-CH always urged to get more information about what had been discussed in the past and to initiate all necessary steps as early as possible.

The discussion about the concept as well as the analysis of feasibility studies should have been completed already at the time when the question for the location of New Hasankeyf was raised. So, by repeating the administrative data that led to the proposal and actual decision for the location of New Hasankeyf in the document “General Concept for Hasankeyf”, it becomes very clear that no cultural heritage concept for old Hasankeyf was available at that time. Scenarios were artificially considered without taking into account cultural landscape settings at the vicinity of Hasankeyf, on both banks of Tigris: One of the options for a new site of Hasankeyf, Ucyol seems better for

a sustainable cultural heritage strategy due to its location closer to the old site, and being a part of the archaeological landscape context of Hasankeyf according to the preliminary observations in the field. Today, all concepts have to be subordinated to this decision that only took into consideration costs and the actual legal situation of land ownership but not necessarily the possible impact on the future income situation of the local people. This creates additional problems for the preservation of cultural heritage (the proposed transfer of several monuments by crossing the river neither reflects the international recommendation for greatest possible authenticity of a site nor takes technical feasibility and costs very much into account; the artificial creation of several areas which all shall recall the former town of Hasankeyf separates information rather than integrates; the very restricted access to the Upper town of Hasankeyf, as proposed by only planning the possibility to go there by boat, most probably neither supports the need of income restoration of the inhabitants nor will it be of help to improve constant maintenance and conservation measures for the monuments in the Upper town).

3. Cultural Heritage Park Concept and Museum

The actual concept for the planned cultural park nearby New Hasankeyf has been initialized by collecting information about international different approaches to concepts for cultural parks. In addition, a survey of the specific features of Hasankeyf has been started and described. No concrete evaluation regarding possible concepts for Hasankeyf has been undertaken so far – on the contrary, at least in the written documents possible concepts have been kept as vague as possible. In general, this is a very positive approach since it allows contribution and evaluation of the arguments both from the international perspective and national stakeholders. So, the approach of the documents available are highly appreciated. Taking into consideration the tight time-schedule for the project, however, further data collection and evaluation with regard of the special situation of Hasankeyf is desperately wanted. Oral discussions with PIU-CH as well as the written statement (signed in November 2008, CoE-CH did not receive any information on that except for footnote 59 in the document “Hasankeyf cultural heritage park and museum architectural report”) in the report makes it clear that there are already additional scenarios for the concept of the Cultural Heritage Park and especially the Museum under discussion and evaluation that are not available to CoE-CH yet. The decision signed by the MoCT obviously has not only been taken without further involvement of different teams developing super-ordinate concepts but without further notice to other stakeholders or the CoE-CH as well. This decision can only be considered as very premature, since the general concepts for Hasankeyf as well as for the Cultural Heritage Park have not been finalized yet. At the moment, for CoE-CH the only possibility to evaluate more concrete concepts for the Cultural Heritage Park is to refer to document “Hasankeyf cultural heritage park and museum architectural report” page 5, Fig. 1. It shows a “cultural axis” leading to the cultural heritage park, the location of a huge museum but no proposal yet how to integrate the different monuments that should be relocated to the park. Since the relocation of several monuments has been distributed to the public in the past (website of the project) and is part of the contracts explanation as soon as possible is needed about the background of the changed concept presented here. Obviously several ideas for the cultural park are not justified sufficiently at the moment, concurring without offering the possibility to follow the different arguments. Information about the concept for a museum within the Cultural Heritage Park is shortly given on pg. 35 of the above mentioned report. They are formulated in a highly dense language and without further detailing and explanation.

The approach remains not understandable to CoE-CH. It is impossible to define the type of museum appropriate for Hasankeyf at the moment since it is not yet clear which kind of objects will characterize the future museum. There is a big difference whether monumental architecture (for instance for preservation reasons) have to be integrated into a museum or mainly archaeological objects will be under display.

It has to be stated that the presented concept does not present any information about costs and time-schedules.

4. Archaeological Park Concept / Open Air museum

A different team started to develop concepts for an archaeological park and open air museum within the boundary of the Upper town of Hasankeyf. As in the case of the Cultural Heritage Park a major part of the considerations again refer to a characterisation of Hasankeyf and possible approaches as developed for projects all over the world. Several proposals discussed on a theoretical basis are not relevant for Hasankeyf (for instance underwater museum). Some of the mentioned characteristics of Hasankeyf obviously only describe the current situation but do not take into consideration the future situation (pg. 7: the Tigris is the only natural river and canyon eco-system remaining in Turkey; pg. 11: husbandry is another important means of subsistence: it will not be permitted in Hasankeyf in the future; pg. 12 basis for figures of future employment opportunities are very optimistic). Description of monuments of Hasankeyf stops after mentioning three monuments. In addition, necessary working steps that will contribute to a comprehensive concept, have been defined and presented. Oral information by MoCT members of PIU-CH, however, allows the warning that all these proposals are in a very early state of development, have obviously not been discussed yet in the ministry and are not “approved” yet. In general, the possibility for open discussion is a very positive sign in the phase of project conceptualisation. It is, however, not clear to the CoE-CH whether the presented ideas will be taken into consideration at all in the future.

5. Geo-stability analysis

In June 2009 CoE-CH received documents on the general description of the geological situation of Hasankeyf. The document informs about the general geological situation of the closer region and some characteristics of the Upper town of Hasankeyf. The study ends with some general recommendations about future activities. The study is a first and important step. It gives preliminary answer on the possible chemical/geological reaction bedrock might have after inundation and the impact on the monuments built on or into this bedrock. Contrary to the oral discussions in Hasankeyf where the geologists tried to deny all major impact of the water to the bedrock, in the presented documents hints for such an impact are mentioned (p. 30). The study stresses the fact that there is in some areas vertical erosion that will affect monuments in the not very far future. Proposals for possible action is not added to the study. It is obvious that much more detailed studies are necessary in order to be able to develop realistic projects for the preservation of some of the important monuments. Similar to all other studies the question of budget and time-schedules for these activities should be evaluated as soon as possible, along with projects for geological analysis in detail that have to be carried out in close cooperation and discussion with the archaeologists involved in projects in the Upper town.

6. Documentation of historical monuments, analysis of urgent conservation measures

Documentation of two monuments, (Orta Kapı, Zeynel Bey Türbesi) have been completed in the meantime. The documentation is approved by the Regional Conservation Council and has been discussed with the CoE-CH. Both monuments were documented in high quality and offer, in addition to the drawings derived from photogrammetry already several years ago, a documentation of damages and a concept for urgent conservation measures. They are a firm basis for the start of urgent conservation measures as well as a start for feasibility studies for strengthening of the construction and relocation. CoE-CH had asked for the presentation of examples of this kind of studies by choosing two monuments of different structures. Time schedules for the documentation of other monuments have been presented in the CHAP.

One, however, should keep in mind, that according to the project planning of PIU-CH all works for documentation of monuments are to be tendered and carried out by companies. Tremendous differences in quality have been observed already in the past and remain unsolved. Information about an installed quality control has been given in the meantime. Except for the two monuments mentioned above no recent documentation has been presented yet. The presented quality control system, therefore, still awaits proof of effectivity.

7. Scientific analysis of historical monuments on the basis of the documentation

In all discussions about the special importance of monuments of Hasankeyf or about the steps of documentation of a monument as well as by evaluation the CHAP it becomes obvious that the scientific analysis of historical monuments still is nearly completely neglected. This is most probably due to the fact that no scholars coming from technical universities and familiar with the international discussion of scientific approaches to historical monuments are involved yet in PIU-CH. At the moment, only the technical aspects of the documentation of a monument are defined and organized. In addition, the art historical evaluation, comparison and interpretation is taken into account as well – which would be the last step of an scientific analysis of the architectural structure of a monument. Documentation of a monument is bound into the framework of tendering architectural works. This field of services usually does not get its order from the field of archaeological or only partially preserved historical monuments where special methods have to be applied. These methods are neither defined within the usual tendering systems nor are they understood by architects working with more modern buildings. It is likely that cost estimations do not take into account the necessary special methods and cooperation with scholars.

The urgent request of CoE-CH for an integration of scientific analysis of historical monuments has not been taken into consideration yet.

8. Feasibility studies for restoration of monuments

Will be delivered in connection with the feasibility studies for relocation. Documents are not available yet, expected for winter 2009/10. Therefore, evaluation has to be postponed.

9. Feasibility studies for relocation of monuments

Feasibility studies for the relocation of monuments had been requested for two monuments. Aim of this request was to gain an approximative estimation about the technical feasibility of a relocation and information about the effort needed to relocate monuments (budget and time). Only on this basis it will be possible to realistically develop concepts for the Cultural Heritage Park and to present feasible concepts for whole Hasankeyf for the public. Since the restoration, strengthening of monuments and relocation will be the most expensive part of the cultural heritage activities, these feasibility studies are the most important ones regarding realistic planning.

Feasibility studies have been started in spring 2009 and are estimated to be completed by end of the year 2009/beginning of 2010. Documents that have been presented in May and June 2009 do not add much to concrete questions on these topics. They are, on the contrary, rather cautious to state already now that relocation of whole monuments will be possible in more than 2-3 cases. This is a positive development since it shows that studies have correctly be started with the very basic analysis. First evaluation, discussed orally, highlights the extremely high costs for the relocation. At the moment, it only can be hoped that it will be not only 2-3 monuments that will be possible to relocate for either reasons of preservation or budget.

Recommendations:

1. Tourism concept: The concepts highlights the overwhelming dependence of New Hasankeyf on the cultural tourism. Tourism, however, is threatened by several and severe obstacles. On the basis of the feasibility analysis and the description of worst case scenarios, in addition, alternative concepts should be presented regarding the question what could be done if tourism fails as income opportunity.

2. General concept for Hasankeyf: as soon as all basic data regarding conservation, restoration and relocation feasibility are available one should focus on the development of a final general concept by organizing a conference by inviting international experts and scholars. Aim of that conference would be to collect more information about other projects facing similar problems and to organize a mutual brainstorming on the special case of Hasankeyf. In general, on the basis of the then available basic data all arguments should be re-discussed again – even the ones for the location of the Cultural Heritage Park.

3. Cultural Heritage Park Concept and Museum: The development of concepts for the Cultural Heritage Park have to be specified as soon as possible. Without such specification decisions and approvals of plans anticipating not yet finalized concepts for the park are very premature and should be annulated and re-opened for discussion – preferably international discussion – again.

4. Archaeological Park Concept / Open Air museum: The concepts for the Archaeological Park and Open Air Museum should be developed in close discussion and in reference to the overall concept for Hasankeyf. At the moment, this integrative type of approach is not really visible in the presented documents. It is, however, demanded by PIU-CH itself who should be encouraged to further work on this concept.

In addition, it is necessary to remind all parties that the Upper Town of Hasankeyf has to be considered as an A-category site as well as a B-category site at the same time. Urgent conservation of monuments is needed if the already excavated monuments shall be preserved for the future. Partly urgent measures are necessary for monuments built on rocks with erosion problems. On the other hand, it is not necessary and would be highly contra productive to start large scale excavations in not yet excavated areas. In this case, the B-category definition of the site should be used to protect that areas from hasty rescue excavations. On the contrary, since the Upper Town of Hasankeyf will be the only part that will be preserved excavations there should acknowledge the highly important historical role of Hasankeyf. The more excavations there will be carried out to the most advanced methodologies (which usually means that they are slower as in rescue areas) the more information will be gained for the interpretation of the impressive history of that town.

5. Geo-stability analysis: Detailed geological studies should be started immediately in order to be able to develop realistic projects for the preservation of some of the important monuments. Similar to all other studies the question of budget and time-schedules for these activities should be evaluated as soon as possible, along with projects for geological analysis in detail that have to be carried out in close relation and discussion with the archaeologists involved in projects in the Upper town.

6. Documentation of historical monuments, analysis of urgent conservation measures: Despite the fact that the documentation of two monuments presented in May 2009 is of high quality, CoE-CH was alarmed by several examples of other preliminary documentations presented in 2008 that showed severe lack of quality. Despite the fact that a quality control system has been described in the meantime it is highly recommended to insist that at least one of the architects/architectural historians foreseen as members of PIU in the FAM should be a senior expert in his field. This would help to avoid that lack of quality will be only detected after delivery of finalized documentations. The latter would not only be a waste of time and money but most probably would create a lot of juridical discussions / problems as well. The earlier it is possible to get insight into the quality of documentation the better. One should not forget that this documentation has to be the basis for all future decisions and activities. In a high number of cases this will be the last information about a monument that will be available after inundation. Quality of documentation, therefore, is most important for all works.

7. Scientific analysis of historical monuments on the basis of the documentation: CoE-CH repeats its request for the integration of scientific analysis of the structure of architectural monuments. Together with the technical documentation this kind of analysis for most of the monuments will be the only information that will survive inundation. Only now it can be started and integrated! We highly recommend to hire a senior specialist in architecture / history of architecture as a member of PIU-CH who is familiar with the international scientific discussion and approach in this field.

8. and 9. Feasibility studies for restoration and relocation of monuments: Both activities urgently need completion and integration of their results into the general discussion of concepts for Hasankeyf. Information at the moment is too limited for further recommendations.

ANNEXES

A1 PHOTOS

All the pictures on the following pages were taken in May 2009.



Photo 1: Excavations in Ilisu village

Rescue excavations in Ilisu village started in spring 2009 as part of the cultural heritage documentation in phase I area.



Photo 2: Excavations Ziviya Tivilki (close to the construction site)

Excavations at Ziviya Tivilki were started in spring 2009 as part of the rescue documentation of cultural heritage in the area of the construction site.

Remains of unusual massive buildings were unearthed which allow to interpret the site as a small but important structure.



Photo 3: Protection of Boncuklu Field

Boncuklu Field, close to the construction site, is one of the areas that are important for the history of the region. Excavation is planned. For the time being the site is by surrounding poles in order to protect is from unintentional damage



Photo 4: Cultural heritage survey along the street Midyat - Dargeçit

The street Midyat – Dargeçit has to be enlarged and its route partly transferred. It is, therefore, defined as B-category area. A Cultural Heritage survey was carried out in spring 2009. Remains of several historical sites were found, preliminary documented and entered into the database.



Photo 5: Remains of a village at the street Midyat - Dargeçit

For instance, foundations of a village on yet unknown date were found at the Midyat – Dargeçit road.



Photo 6: Remains of a village at the street Midyat – Dargeçit, cistern

Most houses of the village, found at the Midyat – Dargeçit road, had a cistern.



Photo 7: Arcosole grave near the village at the Midyat – Dargeçit road
Several arcosole graves were found close to the village at the Midyat – Dargeçit road. The grave most probably date to the Roman/Late Roman Period.