



“Towards the definition of a measurable
environmentally sustainable transport”

Assessment of the evaluation of the cultural heritage indicator

Prof. Lilian Karali

ikarali@arch.uoa.gr





Nowadays environment and past, culture and nature are in danger, nevertheless in many cases they cause big difficulties in everyday life. In this life, in which nothing and nobody are absolutely similar, numeric references are more than needed and generally respected.





- Considering the cultural past, the quality and quantity of testimonies and remains from our ancestors reveal a great diversification from country to country.
- Richness density and cultural heritage varies from place to place, accordingly to the historic and geological finds and their relation with the environment on each occasion (e.g. the peculiarities of the historic cityscapes of Cairo, Athens or Rome).





If a quantitative indicator was to be implemented in order to esteem the damage to the cultural heritage due to land uptake, environments known for their historicity would seem to be suffering either from loss of cultural values or from transport infrastructure.





- The concept of environmental indicators has been applied with big difficulties in regard to the interaction of transportation with the cultural heritage from country to country.
- Trying to evaluate the 10 indicators, presented by Mr Karkalis,





Table 30: Evaluation of indicators of loss of cultural heritage.

Indicator	Category									
	Representation			Operation			Application			
	Validity	Reliability	Sensitivity	Measurability	Data availability	Ethical concerns	Transparency	Interpretability	Target relevance	Actionability
1 st level	xxx	xx	xx	x	xx	xx	x	xx	xx	xx
2 nd level	x	xx	xxx	xxx	x	xxx	xxx	xxx	xx	xx

x=poor; xx=limited; xxx=good; xxxx=excellent.



I arrive at the following observations.
Referring to **Validity**, I suggest that the estimation of quality sometimes equates with subjective viewings and that the calculation of quantity is relative, because it's not always important for an objective evaluation concerning with the importance of an archaeological site.





Considering the credibility of the next two indicators -which are related to **Measurement**- I consider them both as reliable, judging from the reliability of numbers and the possible predictable advantages resulting from **Sensitivity**.





Making reference to the criteria which emerged from **Monitoring**, I suggest that **Measurability** often leads to controversial indications and ethical appraisals should include the national, religious and symbolic traditions of each country under review.





Finally, I regard the criteria which
issue from **Management**
dependable enough for an
objective estimation of the
importance of each area with
archaeological / historical or
natural / environmental interest.





The indicators appear to be enough **effective and acceptable**, with the certainty of their increasing importance together with the passage of time, despite their necessity for further elaboration. An archaeologist's viewing of nature differs from an environmentalist's corresponding one.





- Archaeologists understand the “integral entity” as a physical self defined mainly by its natural surroundings and its dynamic interaction with other cultural entities.
- Whenever specific monuments coexist with nature, we have to bring this blending to prominence, avoiding separation policies which may cause incalculable visual and aesthetic damage in the presentation of our historic and natural heritage.





Conclusions-1

Summarizing my observations, I underline as possible failings the presumable competition among archaeological and environmental zones, the shortage of bibliographical references and the complicated legislative framework in Greece.

On the other hand, I consider as assets the potential for accessibility to a large data volume, the financial benefits, the increasement of knowledge through construction activities (new researches, large scale excavations, publications, exhibitions etc) and the approach of various scientific disciplines, especially in the field of terminology and language.





Conclusions-2

As an active archaeologist, who often participates in decision making committees, I welcome this first important scientific work, looking forward to see it completed and furthermore elaborated in the future.



Thank you...

