EUROPEAN EXPERT NETWORK ON CULTURE (EENC)

Mapping of practices in the EU Member States on Participatory governance of cultural heritage to support the OMC working group under the same name (Work Plan for Culture 2015-2018)

by Margherita Sani, Bernadette Lynch, Jasper Visser and Alessandra Gariboldi

This document has been prepared by Margherita Sani, Bernadette Lynch, Jasper Visser and Alessandra Gariboldi on behalf of the European Expert Network on Culture – EENC.

This paper reflects the views only of the EENC authors and the European Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Executive summary

The term "participatory governance" can be understood either as a process by which authority is released and empowerment ensured or as a process which allows for the adoption of management models whereby responsibility is shared and decisions are taken by communities rather than by individuals. The concept of participation in the cultural heritage sector indeed reflects a general cultural shift in the 21st century which has transformed individuals from cultural consumers to cultural producers.

On the one hand, an ongoing trend to democratize cultural heritage organizations has made them more accessible to wider audiences, socially relevant and responsive to the publics' needs and interests. On the other, a genuine and widespread desire to participate in community and cultural life is driving more and more people to actively engage in taking care of and to assume responsibility for cultural heritage. In addition and mostly due to the easy availability of digital tools, individuals nowadays no longer need traditional organizational structures to pursue objectives of general interest with regard to the protection and valorisation of cultural heritage.

An analysis at European level shows that there is a variety of participatory practices, many of which, however, cannot be labelled as practices of "participatory governance". In fact, although there might be a high level of involvement of citizens or communities, such practices do not necessarily foresee a system of "shared responsibility" for the cultural heritage resources at stake. Nevertheless, they sometimes pave the way for future true participatory governance practices.

The report presents a variety of examples reflecting several nuances of participation and placing them along the continuum described in the participation frameworks developed by Wilcox and Simon, while at the same time distinguishing between interactivity and participation and between a top down and a bottom up approach. Different heritage resources are at the core of the case studies illustrated, from archaeology to built and natural heritage, monuments, museums, libraries and archives, immaterial heritage (in particular memories and stories), with one significant example taken from the performing arts. Different levels of participatory governance emerge from the case studies ranging from mere consultation to co-creation, from deciding and acting together to host and grassroots projects initiated by a community and only later connected with an institution.

The case studies collected have been positioned along two axes – the framework of participation and the top-down/bottom-up continuum – in an attempt to identify those which could be taken as exemplary of "participatory governance". This exercise has made clear that in depth qualitative research would be needed to come to a final conclusion about the status of each project. Consequently, the case studies have been presented in short and extended versions, the latter being more significant and evolved forms of participatory governance where,

through direct contact with the protagonists, it was possible to investigate how activities are carried out and in which way the project develops.

The "Special Categories" include World Heritage Sites, European Cultural Routes, European Capitals of Culture and European funded projects, all of which offer significant potential for collaboration at all levels – European, national, regional and local - and yield interesting examples of participatory governance and practices. In addition, a crowdmap call was launched, inviting the submission of case studies on www.crowdmap.com/map/participatoryheritage, to create a database which could, over time, grow autonomously.

The final considerations included in the report have emerged both from the analysis of the case studies as well as from a literature review.

We clearly live in a time when a great profusion of participation rhetoric has matured, not always coupled with a real ceding of authority, or with a real effort to assess the realities behind the phenomenon. If one of the emerging trends is the increasing number of initiatives and policies which define themselves as participatory, the challenge is to move behind the scenes to hear the voices of those involved both on the delivery and on the receiving end, to assess what impact participation has had on people's lives and to what extent it has actually changed the organizational structure and management procedures of the institutions involved.

Another current trend looks at participation in the context of capacity development, meaning that the focus is not on what people can do for institutions but rather on what people can do for themselves through the use of institutional resources, a major move away from an institution-centric view.

The challenge here is for cultural heritage organisations to change their institutional habits and to learn to work in partnership towards people building strong communities, a move from being leaders to becoming facilitators, also reflected in the public's shift "from users and choosers to makers and shapers".

If cultural heritage organisations have to start considering themselves as resources for community use, this is certainly a big challenge which requires organisational change for institutions to become effective partners, capable of involving the public as a critical friend and key change agent.

Finally, another challenge for cultural heritage organisations is to create mechanisms which are able to support independent initiatives and put into place the appropriate regulatory frameworks and management models to accommodate participatory processes initiated at grassroots level, making the collaboration between citizens and institutions a permanent feature of public policies.

About the authors

Margherita Sani holds a degree in Literature and Philosophy (University of Bologna) and an MA in Museums and Galleries Administration (City University of London). Since 1985 she has been employed by the Institute of Cultural Heritage of the Region Emilia-Romagna, where she is in charge of international projects, in particular on museum education, lifelong learning and intercultural dialogue. In the last 15 years she has designed and managed several international and EU funded projects, some of which have been identified as best practice by the EU Commission. The most recent one LEM, The Learning Museum Network (www.lemproject.eu), has brought together 85 organisations from 25 European countries, the USA and Argentina. As LEM coordinator, she has recently been invited to join the Museum Ed-AMECO network, which gathers museum education organisations and museum networks in Canada and North America. Ms. Sani is or has been member of various network boards and juries and has published extensively on the issue of heritage and heritage conservation.

Dr. Bernadette Lynch is an academic and museum professional with twenty-five years' experience in senior management in UK and Canadian museums. Formerly Deputy Director at the Manchester Museum at the University of Manchester, she has developed an international reputation for ethical, innovative participatory practice and for her writing and research and advisory work on public engagement and participation. She has undertaken extensive research into museums and social justice and participation around the UK, and led organisational transformation processes. This includes research for the Paul Hamlyn Foundation, producing the influential *Whose Cake is it Anyway?* report. She publishes widely on all aspects of participatory democracy in museums and galleries and lectures internationally. She is Honorary Research Associate at University College London (UCL). Her work is freely available online: https://ucl.academia.edu/BernadetteLynch

Alessandra Gariboldi is a researcher at the Fondazione Fitzcarraldo in Torino (Italy), where she also collaborates with the 'Osservatorio Culturale del Piemonte. She works on issues relating to audience development for museums, particularly through the use of qualitative research techniques, as well as on the evaluation of cultural projects. She has specialized in museum education and communication linked to heritage; she also collaborates with several institutions active in the cultural field as a consultant to monitor and evaluate their activity programme for the public, focusing especially on the non-public and on the development of new audiences.

Jasper Visser defines himself as a change agent, innovator and facilitator specialised in culture, heritage and the arts. With over 10 years of international experience he helps institutions deal with challenges, formulate strategies for the future and build successful teams. Jasper focuses on digital strategies, new media and technology, audience development and innovative business models. He works directly through his personal platform "Inspired by coffee" (http://inspiredbycoffee.com/).

Table of contents

Background / Context

The Work Plan for Culture 2015-2018 adopted by the European Council on 25 November 2014 focuses on four key priorities where action at EU level can deliver an added value:

1. accessible and inclusive culture;
2. cultural heritage;
3. cultural and creative sectors: creative economy and innovation;
4. promotion of cultural diversity, culture in EU external relations and mobility.

With regard to the priority area *Cultural heritage,* the Work Plan foresees the establishment of two Open Method of Coordination (OMC) Working Groups.

The first OMC Working Group started its work in April in 2015 and will end in 2016. It will look at participatory governance of cultural heritage, by identifying, innovative approaches to the multilevel governance of tangible, intangible and digital heritage which involve the public sector, private stakeholders and the civil society. Cooperation between different levels of governance and policy areas will be addressed as well.

To do so, experts taking part in the OMC working group will map and compare public policies at national and regional level to identify good practices also in cooperation with existing heritage networks, and produce a manual of good practice for policy makers and cultural heritage institutions by the end of 2016.

The present EENC mapping is based on and complements the policy paper requested by the EENC in March 2015[1] to support the work of the above OMC Working Group.

The mapping takes into account the Council conclusions on participatory governance of cultural heritage (2014/C 463/01)[2], adopted on 25 November 2014 and the Commission Communication "Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe" of July 2014[3].

Objectives of the report

The objectives of the present report are:

✓ To provide a solid basis for discussion and reflection for the OMC working group on "Participatory governance of cultural heritage", in particular for their task to map and compare public policies at national and regional level.

✓ To identify and present the challenges and future possibilities with regard to public policies on engaging communities, local population, cultural institutions and stakeholders in valuing and managing cultural heritage on one hand, and with regard to the development of

---

[1] The "policy paper" was prepared by Margherita Sani and made available to the OMC group for their first meeting on 16 April 2015.
[2] http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52014XG1223%2801%29&from=EN.
[3] http://ec.europa.eu/culture/library/publications/2014-heritage-communication_en.pdf.

multilevel and multi-stakeholder governance frameworks for the management of cultural heritage resources on the other.

✓ To identify examples of practices that appear to be the most efficient or mostly used to develop participatory approaches to heritage governance and management in as many EU Member States as possible.

Methodology

The study relies on desk research and on a number of interviews with managers of cultural organisations and institutions, experts in the field of heritage management and other protagonists of participatory practices, in some cases ordinary citizens.

Given the nature of the topic and the difficulty to recognise true participatory governance if looked at superficially, the experts have favoured a qualitative approach and tried to carry out in depth analyses wherever possible.

They have also attempted to classify the case studies collected to identify and describe extensively those which more closely embody the idea of participatory governance, defined "as a strategic and interactive people-centred process of seeking the active involvement of relevant stakeholders in the framework of public action — i.e. public authorities and bodies, private actors, civil society organisations, NGOs, the volunteering sector and interested people — in decision-making, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of cultural heritage policies and programmes, to increase accountability and transparency of public resource investments as well as to build public trust in policy decisions".

1   Introduction

The concept of participation in the cultural heritage field goes hand in hand with a general cultural shift in the 21st century from individuals being cultural consumers to cultural producers.

On the one hand, an ongoing trend to democratize cultural heritage organizations has made them more accessible to wider audiences, socially relevant and responsive to the publics' needs and interest. On the other, a genuine and widespread desire to participate in community and cultural life - often coupled with mistrust in the political and institutional decision making process – is driving more and more people to actively engage in taking care of and responsibility for cultural heritage. On top of that, thanks in great part to the easy availability of digital tools, individuals nowadays no longer need traditional organizational structures to achieve their objectives (see for instance Shirky, 2008 and Tapscott & Williams, 2006).

In the mapping exercise, which our team carried out during the months of April and May 2015 and that involved contacts with a high number of professionals, researchers and practitioners, we were immediately confronted with the question of how to define "Participatory governance of cultural heritage". Participation seems widespread and takes many different forms. As we'll see in later case studies, in Helsinki citizens work together on the planning and budgeting of new institutions, in the Baltics and Scotland ordinary people take responsibility for the maintenance of built heritage, while in the Netherlands and Germany people work together to document their shared heritage.

Considering the wide array of cases of participation, we came to the conclusion that the best way to define participatory governance in short - however fully endorsing the more comprehensive definition provided by the Council Conclusions of November 2014[4] - is when it means shared responsibility. This is a continuum, as we will see in section 2. Sometimes it means a traditional cultural heritage institution sharing some of its responsibility with its audience, as we see for instance in the case of the Derby Silk Mill. This can be considered a top-down approach to participatory governance. At the other end of the continuum are initiatives started by a community which eventually lead to the establishment of some sort of institution, such as in the case of the Resistance Museum of Latvia. This we call a bottom-up approach. As such, participatory governance is a process of releasing authority on the one side and empowerment on the other, as well as the adoption of a management model, which allows for decisions to be taken by communities rather than individuals.

Most case studies sit somewhere on this continuum, and present a variety of nuances of participation. Sometimes they seem to fall outside the continuum because of their unique

---

[4] European Council conclusions on participatory governance of cultural heritage (2014/C 463/01), adopted on 25 November 2014, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52014XG1223%2801%29&from=EN

circumstances. We decided not to ignore or to disregard these odd birds, as they sometimes show the way to or can be considered as preparatory steps for true participatory governance. Since they concern different kinds of heritage resources, they are also indicative of how participation takes different forms depending on whether it applies to museums, monuments, sites or immaterial heritage.

Short case studies as different points along the continuum will be illustrated in section 3, whereas the extended case studies described in section 4, according to us, embody more comprehensive and fuller examples of participatory governance. In section 5 we specifically mention World Heritage Sites and European Cultural Routes, which by their very nature (in many cases stretching over a wide territory and involving many stakeholders) offer significant potential for collaboration at all levels – European, national, regional and local. Our decision was to point these out to the OMC Group as possible areas to explore case by case in their own countries.

In a similar manner we thought it would be useful to introduce the category "European funded projects" in the mapping, as more and more organizations are currently developing proposals focused on "Audience development" as a response to the priorities set by the 2014-2020 EU Programmes, in particular Creative Europe. Again, this is an area, like the European Capitals of Culture, which is worth being monitored by the OMC during the course of its work, as it might yield some interesting examples of participatory governance.

And finally, since the field is so wide and we ourselves were at times literally and pleasantly overwhelmed by the quantity of information and the quality of suggestions which came from the sector, we decided to leave the OMC Group with a crowdmap, which, should they wish so, can be incremented over time and function as a companion to their work. Launched by Jasper Visser on 22 April 2015, the crowdmap invites all those who want to submit a short description of a participatory practice or an example of participatory governance of cultural heritage by uploading it on crowdmap.com/map/participatoryheritage.

2   The continuum of participation: from consultation to hosted projects, from top down to bottom up

Participatory governance is not a binary characteristic – a project is or isn't governed in a participatory way – but rather a continuum – a project is to some extent an example of participatory governance. This continuum has many variations and nuances, as can be seen from the number of participation frameworks that can be found in literature. Although all of these frameworks are simplifications that do not do justice to the complexities we found in the case studies, they offer some guidelines to structure them.

Before we consider participatory governance, it is important to differentiate it from 'interactivity'. Interactivity is a property of the technology, while participation is a property of culture (Jenkins et al., 2005). A project can easily be made interactive, i.e. by inviting the audience to vote or rank ideas, whereas participation requires a transformation in the organization. Some projects that were added to the crowdmap, for example, are interactive rather than participatory.

In different points in time, different taxonomies were developed acting as reference frameworks to try to capture the variety of routes from non-participatory to participatory. One of the earlier ones is Arnstein's Ladder of Citizen Participation (1969). This ladders moves from manipulation, via therapy, informing, consultation, placation, partnership and delegated power ultimately to citizen control. Citizens move up the ladder when they and the institution fostering participation grow in confidence and skills. A shortcoming of this model is that participation is something that needs to be fostered, rather than something that happens naturally whenever people come together. Wilcox's Ladder of Participation (1994) is shorter, but has a similar institution-centric view. People move from merely being informed, to being consulted, deciding together and then acting together to ultimately being supported in their independent community interests and initiatives. When we apply this framework to our case studies, we can more easily map them to the different phases Wilcox distinguishes, especially when we accept that not all participation is initiated by an institution, as is the case with bottom-up initiatives.

Simon (2010) presents even another framework for participation, which is the simplest and most far-reaching of those presented in this paper. It makes a distinction between contributory projects where the audience has a small contribution in an institutionally controlled process, collaborative projects, where the audience becomes a partner in an institutionally controlled process, co-creative projects, where audience and institution jointly control a process, to ultimately hosted projects where the audience is in full control within the context of the institution. Simon's framework allows the inclusion of the bottom-up projects we found in our research, initiated by a community and only later connected with an institution. On the other hand it misses the subtleties of participation in the early phases of the ladder. In this paper, therefore, we propose to map the projects using a combination of Wilcox's and Simon's frameworks with the additional ability to distinguish top-down and bottom-up projects. Needless to say projects that only 'inform' have not been considered in this research.

Participation takes many forms. Examples of practice in the cultural heritage field demonstrate a very wide range of activities and types of engagement with diverse social groups and diverse types of heritage, achieving a multiplicity of outcomes and impacts. We've tried to position the case studies we collected on two axes – the framework of participation and the top-down/bottom-up continuum – in an attempt to identify those which could be taken as exemplary of "participatory governance". We recognize however that in depth qualitative research is needed to come to a final conclusion about the status of each project. Therefore we divided up the case studies into short and extended ones, the latter being those where more significant

and evolved forms of participatory governance seem to appear and where a direct contact with the protagonists was possible to actually investigate how activities are carried out and in which way the project develops.

Figure 1: Framework for the mapping of the case studies, combining the frameworks of Simon and Wilcox with the top-down / bottom-up distinction. Some case studies have been mapped on this framework. We only consider the case studies towards the right of the framework to be examples of participatory governance.

The indication of a website for these projects/activities is important for the OMC Group to possibly follow them up. What could initially look like "participatory governance" might not result to be so in the long run and interesting evolutions might occur.

As for the short projects, one might well argue that some of them are not examples of pure participatory governance, but represent participatory practices en route to participatory governance. We decided not to discard them, in the belief that they might be considered as preparatory steps for activities where a more significant commitment to the sharing of responsibility of the institution involved and more robust forms of engagement of the audience might emerge at a later stage.

3 Short case studies: Participatory practice and governance in cultural heritage across Europe

In this section we will describe a wide variety of case studies from all over Europe that give an insight into the width and breadth of participatory practice and governance in cultural heritage. We've structured them making a distinction between top-down projects (initiated by institutions) and bottom-up projects (initiated by communities) and the Wilcox/Simon framework from section 2. Not all of these case studies are examples of pure participatory governance, but they will give pointers about the ingredients of participatory governance.

3.1 Top-down projects

3.1.1 Spain - Románico Norte and Románico Atlántico - Involving residents

Wilcox/Simon: Consultation

If heritage has to become a source of local development, it must be valued by society. This is the underlying philosophy of this project, carried out in northern Spain, which acknowledges residents, cultural heritage and landscape as a territory's best resources to revitalize the economy and culture of the territory by implementing a responsible and sustainable model for tourism.

Its main objective is the integral restoration of 54 Romanesque churches, hermitages, and monasteries, including work on the movable heritage assets and the surrounding land. In parallel it intervenes with a series of actions to activate the local population and properly communicate the contents of the plan through awareness raising activities addressed to three main targets: school children, tourist guides and residents. Apart from the restoration of the monuments, the project has looked for solutions, which allow the buildings to be used for a variety of purposes, recreational and cultural, and not only for liturgical use. This is complicated especially due to the fact that the churches are dispersed in rural areas and the residents are for the majority elderly. Therefore special initiatives are launched, like the one called "We are Open, Románico Norte" (Abrimos Románico Norte) organized during the Easter holidays and in the summer.

www.romaniconorte.org www.romanicoatlantico.org

http://www.romanicoatlantico.org/en/noticias/ver/the-atlantic-romanesque-plan-will-make-it-possible-to-significantly-save-on-energy-in-yecla/24

3.1.2 Slovenia- Museums and Galleries of Ljubljana – 'Little Museum' Greece - Diazoma – Citizens for the Ancient Theatres

Wilcox/Simon: Contributory

DIAZOMA is an association that aspires to win the support of all Greek institutions and citizens and invites them to adopt an ancient theatre. It seeks to help the responsible civil services and specialist scholars in the research, protection, restoration, enhancement and promotion of the ancient theatres in Greece, as well as the encounter of these monuments with contemporary cultural creation, wherever this is feasible.

It also aims to persuade the economic powers of Greece to contribute to this effort as sponsors, to mobilize local societies with regard to their monuments, to heighten Greek citizens' awareness of their cultural heritage, in conjunction with developing contemporary cultural creation.

Local and prefectural government can contribute through programme contracts, businesses through sponsorship grants, and citizens through the DIAZOMA 'money boxes'.

DIAZOMA seeks to publicize the beauty, the originality, the values, knowledge, aesthetics and harmony of the ancient theatres in all ways: by organizing events, a campaign for each theatre, adopting monuments, by opening bank accounts-money boxes for each ancient venue for spectators and audiences, as well as by utilizing new technologies.

To facilitate the process for citizens, DIAZOMA has set up a special bank account, a 'money box', for each theatre, in which every citizen, according to their means, is able to deposit their contribution for the study, excavation, conservation, restoration and functional incorporation in today's society of the specific ancient theatre.

Volunteers from all over the world are also invited to actively engage in restoration works. DIAZOMA is supportive of voluntary service efforts, helping guide and focus the volunteering work with the assistance of specialised researchers.

The project started in 2008 and is ongoing.

http://www.diazoma.gr/EN/Page_01-01.asp

3.1.3   Malta – The Muza Project – Community curation

Wilcox/Simon: Contributory

MUZA is the name of the new National Museum of Art in Malta, which is currently being developed, inspired by a vision and process, which can be referred to as 'community curation'. The museum is one of the flagship projects for Valletta's capital city of culture title in 2018.

MUZA aims to build on the potential synergies and constant interface with the community through a community-led approach which will have a direct and decisive impact on display narratives, interpretation and communication strategies, as well as the role and definition of the curatorial expertise working at MUŻA.

The end objective of community curation will be the co-creation and constant review of the museum narrative through a negotiated process, which will empower the community and determine its ownership of the museum.

http://heritagemalta.org/muza/

3.1.4   Germany – Digitising the Stadtgeschichtliches Museum Leipzig

Wilcox/Simon: Contributory

The Museum of City History Leipzig has undertaken a project that ultimately transformed the museum into one that now addresses the needs of a modern public. Not only were collections centralized and catalogued in a new collection management system, but the ways in which visitors interact with, communicate knowledge to and receive knowledge from the museum were also completely transformed.

In 2008, the museum first began to present objects to the public on its webpage. A reply button was included that allows website visitors to email any additional information they have directly to the museum. Since 2008, the museum has cooperated with partners in order to take advantage of their own experience and knowledge and has received a considerable amount of feedback from academic researchers, collectors and family descendants that continues to grow steadily. With the collective knowledge from this feedback, the museum has significantly expanded the information about its objects.

Today, there are a total of 300,000 objects, which have been documented and can now be accessed online by the public. Since 2010, this data has been shared nationally and internationally with online portals such as Europeana, Deutsche Digitale Bibliothek and Kalliope.

http://www.stadtgeschichtliches-museum-leipzig.de/index_en.php

3.1.5 Belgium - Gemeenschapsarchief AMVB

Wilcox/Simon: Contributory

The Archive and Museum of Flemish Life in Brussels (AMVB) is a community archive. Their project 'Geef Brusselse jongeren en hun ouders een stem' (Give a voice to youngsters and their parents in Brussels) invited teachers, students and parents of a local school to contribute to an exhibition, interviews and a co-created educational programme. The resulting products allow for renewed history writing.

AMVB is a forum for lifelong learning where people can (re)connect with history in Brussels. Initially, the AMVB connected with the school and encouraged their audience to share their experiences with them. Their input contributed to the follow up of the project and allowed the AMVB to develop new product and reach out to others. It also taught the AMVB about new ways of collaborating with educational institutions, students, teachers and parents.

http://www.amvb.be

3.1.6 Denmark – Danish Butterfly Atlas

Wilcox/Simon: Contributory

The Danish Butterfly Atlas is a national online atlas aimed at mapping the distribution of butterfly species in Denmark. One function of the atlas is to distribute existing data based on the Statens Naturhistoriske Museum's collections, but the public is also encouraged to collect specimens of non-endangered insect species (not just butterflies) for the museum's collections. Using an app for mobile devices (the NaturbasenApp), members of the public can upload precise, georeferenced observations of butterflies and other Danish insect species, which are then displayed on an interactive map. Uploads made to the www.fugleonatur.dk website are also linked to the atlas. Some species are identified by the public in an online forum. The museum focused on butterflies because they are an excellent general indicator of the state of nature. The project enables the development of the collection and its importance to society to be emphasised through engagement with the public.

The project was launched in 2014 and is promoted by the Statens Naturhistoriske Museum (the Natural History Museum of Denmark) in collaboration with a privately owned website and with the general public,

www.sommerfugleatlas.dk

www.fugleognatur.dk

3.1.7   Finland – Everyone´s cultural heritage

Wilcox/Simon: Contributory / deciding together

In order to prepare for the ratification of the FARO convention, Finland set up a project to find out what people actually think of cultural heritage. The aim of the project was to explore in an interactive process and wide public discussion the implications of the ratification and make suggestions for actions. It was also regarded a significant opportunity to arouse discussion on the value of cultural heritage for society. Crowdsourcing was used in order to accumulate ideas, knowledge and experience. An open web consultation, workshops in different parts of the country and active use of social media were used as instruments to gather ideas and views of various interest groups and individual citizens. In the web consultation, the project asked e.g. views on what kind of new and innovative ways and procedures are needed for heritage authorities to co-operate with other actors. Altogether 130 replies were received within the four-month consultation. The project was led by the National Board of Antiquities in close cooperation with the Finnish Local Heritage Foundation.

http://faronsopimus.org/

http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/identities/finland_en.asp

3.1.8   Germany, Historisches Museum Frankfurt

Wilcox/Simon: Deciding together

A reconstruction at the Historical Museum Frankfurt provides the museum with an opportunity for change towards a more participatory institution. The renewal does affect not only the museum's spaces, but also its focus and approaches, transforming the museum from a specialized historical museum into a modern-day city museum. It aims to become a center of information, reflection and discussion about Frankfurt, offering the multi-faceted explanations and backgrounds of the city's past as a frame of reference. In doing so the museum will adopt a new participatory orientation, which takes the wealth of its visitors' experience and knowledge seriously and makes use of it as an integral element.

To this end, the means are being created for a new participatory exhibition series called the "City Lab". Here, with the participation of various groups and initiatives of the local society, exhibitions on changing subjects will be developed. These subjects will not be determined by the museum, but either proposed directly by the groups themselves or worked out jointly.

http://www.historisches-museum.frankfurt.de/

http://sjam.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/MELA-frankfurt.pdf

3.1.9   The Netherlands - National Landscape Drentsche Aa

Wilcox/Simon: Deciding together / acting together

The Dutch National Landscape Drentsche Aa is a successful example of integrated natural and cultural heritage management. This cultural landscape – a river flowing in the North East of the Netherlands - has rich biodiversity as well as archaeological and historical value. Since 2004 government institutions, citizens, nature and heritage organisations, planners and scientists have cooperated intensively in order to provide new integrated strategies for interdisciplinary research, participatory planning and integral landscape management. Expert knowledge of scientists and the knowledge of a large number of local volunteers have been integrated into a landscape biography and digital landscape atlas that acts as a starting point for planning, management and tourism.

Government organisations and other stakeholders have agreed on a common landscape strategy that acts as a platform for sustainable economic growth, with an important role for tourism, which covers about 40% of the regional economy. The integration of cultural and natural heritage is a key factor in this. Citizens play an important role in local planning and local landscape management, supported by both nature and cultural heritage institutions. This has raised awareness and local involvement, and has also reduced management costs considerably.

http://www.drentscheaa.nl/

3.1.10   United Kingdom - Derby Silk Mill

Wilcox/Simon: Deciding together / acting together

Derby Silk Mill is the site of the world's first factory and has been an industrial museum for the last 40 years. Lacking major investments the museum slowly lost its lustre and ultimately had to close its doors in preparation for a redevelopment that started in October 2013. In the redevelopment, a unique approach to developing the museum was used, encouraging visitors and volunteers to become citizen curators, designers and makers.

Through a wide range of events, some initiated by the museum team and some by the community itself, people could voice their ideas for the museum and put them into practice. Participants learned new skills or applied skills they already have to support the redevelopment of Derby's Silk Mill.

http://remakemuseum.tumblr.com/

3.1.11   Finland - Pirkanmaa Provincial Museum - Adopt a Monument

Wilcox/Simon: Acting together

The Pirkanmaa region is rich in a variety of monuments from thousands of years old Stone Age dwelling to the fortifications dating back to the First World War. All of them are in principle "adoptable", although adoption is recommended especially for unused buildings, which are in need of care. The adopter may be a community, an association, a company or a public entity, such as a school. Some groups have formed an association specifically to meet the criteria of adopter. It is noteworthy that no previous experience, special skills, or prior information on

cultural heritage or environmental issues is required of the caretaker, but interest and enthusiasm seem to suffice. However, the expertise at the Pirkanmaa Provincial Museum is available to adopters at all times.

Caretaking is based upon agreements signed between the owner of the site, the adopter and the Pirkanmaa Provincial Museum. The museum is responsible for drafting the agreements and also carrying out negotiations between involved parties. A management plan for the site in question is drawn up, taking into account its condition, maintenance needs, as well as the caretaking group's resources.

The purpose of adoption is not only to take care, research or maintain the sites, but also to make them known to public, organizing a variety of events around them.

http://adoptoimonumentti.fi/?lang=en

3.1.12 Slovenia - The Slovenian Network for the interpretation of Heritage

Wilcox/Simon: Acting together

The Slovenian Network of NGOs for the interpretation of Heritage (SMID) is based on a new concept of networking, inspired by the principles of the Faro Convention. Each partner generates a local network of "heritage communities". The members of these communities are trained to be able to apply for national and international tenders and to run their own business around the interpretation of heritage. As a result, the number of quality heritage projects is increasing and, what is even more encouraging, a growing number of people who have had training are joining the regional development boards where they can promote heritage as an asset for local development and thus participate in drawing up innovative development strategies.

www.smid.si

3.1.13 United Kingdom - Open Museum

Wilcox/Simon: Acting together

The Open Museum (OM) began as a pilot project in 1990 in Glasgow at a time when the city established a number of innovative projects to take museum collections out to those communities, which the museums were failing to reach. Ever since, the OM has worked consistently taking museum collections out into the community, making connections between the objects and individuals and groups, particularly working with people who have little access to museums.

The services offered by the Open Museum are:

- lending (objects, paintings, small exhibitions and handling or reminiscence kits)
- advisory (providing expertise to enable people to develop collections and exhibitions of their own)
- partnerships (community groups coming in to explore collections and use them in their own exhibitions).

Over the years, the OM has worked with some of the most excluded groups and communities in Glasgow: women's groups from the large social housing projects on the periphery of the city, users of mental health services, black community groups, refugees and asylum seekers, etc.

The Open Museum is now based at Glasgow Museums Resource Centre, an open store which houses the collections not on display of all Glasgow Museums. This location has greatly increased the possibility for the OM team to access an extraordinary resource for public engagement and community involvement.

https://www.glasgowlife.org.uk/museums/about-glasgow-museums/open-museum/Pages/home.aspx

3.1.14 Estonia - programme for owners of public buildings

Wilcox/Simon: Acting together

In 2008 the Estonian Open Air Museum broadened its traditional activities as a museum and started training owners of rural heritage buildings throughout Estonia. Most Estonian farm architecture is not listed as a monument. The preservation of this architecture and heritage is the responsibility of the owners. To provide owners with advice and examples to follow, the museum organized different training courses and similar activities.

Case studies from peers are an important element of the training courses. Participants learn by doing. The work of the owners contributes to the preservation and future maintenance of the architecture of the different regions. In the years since its foundation, the Museum has organized more than 80 practical training courses for over 1,700 participants. The project has been awarded a Europa Nostra Award for its exemplary role in involving citizens in the maintenance of heritage.

http://www.europanostra.org/awards/173/

3.1.15 Europe - Europeana 1914-1918

Wilcox/Simon: Contributory / acting together

Europeana 1914-1918 is a project that brings together the efforts from three major European projects about the First World War. It combines national collections, personal stories and film archives in a unique perspective of the First World War, showing it from every side of the battle lines and with insights from every point of view.

Apart from the official archives that Europeana is most comfortable with, the project involves many partners including the University of Oxford to digitize the public's previously unpublished letters, photographs and keepsakes from the war. One tool for this participatory collecting is the Family History Roadshow, an event where everybody can have their personal items photographed and recorded together with the stories that accompany them. Already events like these have gathered over 80,000 objects from citizens to be included in the Europeana archive.

http://www.europeana1914-1918.eu

3.1.16 The Netherlands - Museum Rotterdam

Wilcox/Simon: Acting together

For over a decade Museum Rotterdam has broken through its brick walls and set up urban participation projects. These projects build upon the museum's anthropological skills that help to unravel the contemporary history of urban communities and embed these in the larger history of Rotterdam and the historical collections of the museum. An example is the project *City as Muse,* which involved audiences that were typically unrepresented by the museum in its collecting, programming and exhibition practices.

What started as experimental heritage and participation programmes have become one of the pillars of Museum Rotterdam. The newly developed methods have been integrated into the museum´s professional standards, and can be found in all projects the museum currently develops.

http://museumrotterdam.nl

3.1.17 United Kingdom – Manchester Museum – Collective Conversations

Wilcox/Simon: Acting together

Collective Conversations is a programme started by the Manchester Museum in 2004 with the objective of working collaboratively with communities, involving them in the processes of identification, documentation and interpretation of objects. The idea of Collective Conversations began as a response to the desire within the Museum to increase access to the collections including those, which are not on display, providing communities with the opportunity to contribute to collection-related knowledge.

The programme consists in the setting up of a film studio in a designated area of the museum, called Contact Zone, where facilitated conversation with the public on and about objects take place and are recorded on video. The videos produced are all on the YouTube channel of the Manchester museum and some of them on display in the galleries, next to the objects, which triggered the conversation.

The aim of the programme is to generate discussion and debate between different people through the use of collections, thereby identifying interesting stories and histories and establishing long term, mutually beneficial relationships with the community.

The outcome is quite powerful. According to the museum "These new negotiated interpretations will form the building blocks of a collaborative innovative exhibition process that will challenge orthodoxies and bring new values and ideas into the museum".

http://www.museum.manchester.ac.uk/community/collectiveconversations/

3.1.18 Finland – New Central Library – Voices of City residents

Wilcox/Simon: Contributory/Acting together

Helsinki Central Library 2018 is a new project, whose contents and operation models are being sought in co-operation with the library, city residents, and partners. The Central Library project is based on the idea that the needs and wishes of city residents should be incorporated into the design process of the new functional library at the Helsinki City centre.

The underlying philosophy of the operation is that city residents bring in not only their voices but also their problem-solving skills as a part of the planning process and become messengers of the library. Involving them results in having a Library whose functions, services and contents truly reflect the wishes and needs of the population.

Ideas of residents were therefore collected, discussed, selected and developed into products, services and facilities. The Library provided a platform for this individual and collective activity.

The Central Library was also among the first institutions to try out the most effective form of direct democracy, participatory budgeting. In the trial, the city residents decided what to do with €100,000 of development funding. Four projects were selected out of the eight which had emerged, based on the wishes submitted by the city residents.

http://keskustakirjasto.fi/en/

3.1.19   Sweden – Vi är romer (We are Roma)

Wilcox/Simon: Contributory /Acting together

'Vi är romer' was first a research project (2012-2013) and is now is a co-creative exhibition organized by the Gothenburg city museum to investigate why Roma people are excluded in society, to change the stereotypical view of Roma people, to show the people beyond the myth and change people's attitudes. The project produced: documentation of Roma life in Gothenburg, an exhibition, a book for children, a book for adults (photos and interviews), learning programs, an interactive map http://www.varromskahistoria.se. .

The exhibition will be open throughout 2016 and has attracted 150,000 visitors so far. 1,500 staff members working in the public sector have participated in the learning programmes, the objective of which is to change attitudes with regard to Roma people.

http://goteborgsstadsmuseum.se/om-museet/projekt-och-samarbeten/suspendisse-metus-nisi

3.1.20   Ireland – Chester Beatty Library – Young curators

Wilcox/Simon: Contributory/Acting together

The Chester Beatty Library (CBL) seeks to engage with those communities in the Dublin area who are represented in its Islamic, East Asian and European Collections through a number of events and programmes ranging from cultural family days with the Thai community and Chinese New Year celebrations to art workshops for children and adults, teen club, family activity packs, adult and teen drawing packs, music performances, film, lectures and intercultural storytelling projects in schools.

Since 2007 it has developed several programmes to engage young teenagers to explore their identities through the Islamic, East Asian and European collections and to become young community curators. A collaboration was established with the Forum on Migration and Communications (FOMACS), a multi-media organisation with a strong record of working with migrant groups and youth. On the occasion of the exhibition *China through the Lens of John Thomson 1868-72*, the Library allowed participants behind the scenes of the museum to meet key members of staff, explore the collections on display, view and photograph Chinese textiles, etc. The young people involved attended a five-day course exploring the historical context of

photography, using multi-media to convey ideas with a multi-media designer, looking at street photography with a local photographer echoing John Thomson's work and creating a *blurb book* with the tutors. The young curators were encouraged to develop skills in analysis and critique of how cultures are interpreted and represented through photography. On completion of the project content was uploaded on a purpose-built interactive website and showcased in the Library.

http://pivotalarts.org/youngcurators/

http://issuu.com/tiedongyang/docs/20130928_young_curators_v5_public?e=9446135/5023677

3.2 Bottom-up projects

3.2.1 United Kingdom - Archaeology Scotland – Adopt a monument scheme

Wilcox/Simon: Deciding together/acting together

The idea for the Adopt-a-Monument Scheme was first developed in the 1990s. Between 1991 and 1998, the Council for Scottish Archaeology (CSA) ran Adopt-a-Monument in response to the number of archaeological societies who wanted to look after and take responsibility for cultural heritage sites in their area. A second phase (2006-2009) was funded by Historic Scotland, and was intended as pilot scheme to assess its popularity. Due to the overwhelming response to the pilot project, the Adopt-a-Monument scheme was then developed and is currently running.

The scheme meets the demands of community groups who wish to engage with their local heritage and supports them in taking care of it. Monuments in a broad sense (including gardens, designed landscapes, battlefields, etc.), of any age and from anywhere in Scotland can be proposed with the focus on helping volunteers to improve sites which they are passionate about. The process by which this can be done, however, is by no way straightforward. A project proposal has to be drawn up by the interested party/community group detailing aims, objectives and activities of the intervention, including the formal consent of the landowner as a pre-requisite, a fund raising plan and detailing all aspects of project management, from health and safety to monitoring and sustainability.

Before the project gets under way, an Agreement has to be signed between Archaeology Scotland and the community group undertaking the initiative.

To support the planning and application process, a Toolkit has been produced by Archaeology Scotland. http://www.archaeologyscotland.org.uk/sites/default/files/AaM%20Tool-Kit.pdf

This is an interesting case of a bottom up initiative which has produced a positive and structured response by the public authority - which constantly supports and provides assistance to the local groups - and results in a triangular collaboration between local community, public authorities and private owners/land managers/land occupiers.

Taking part in the scheme equips volunteers with new skills in archaeological fieldwork and conservation, which can be used again and again to promote the heritage of their local area.

http://www.archaeologyscotland.org.uk/our-projects/adopt-monument

3.2.2   Latvia – The Occupation Museum

Wilcox/Simon: Acting together / hosted

The Occupation Museum of Latvia was established back in 1993 by exiled Latvians returning home and not finding it reasonable to wait for decades to see government taking action in establishing a new museum of recent history, or amending existing museum exhibitions in the state run museums.

Over time the Occupation Museum has become not only the undisputed authority on the issues of totalitarian regimes in Latvia, but it has been included in the state protocol (meaning that all foreign diplomatic delegations are showed around in this) and received a law of its own which stipulates secure annual grant-in-aid for this museum and further regulations in its favor. On top of that, the Occupation Museum has built what is now the largest in North-East Europe audio-visual collection of video-testimonies of the survivors of dictatorial regimes etc.

www.okupacijasmuzejs.lv/en

3.2.3   Italy – La Paranza

Wilcox/Simon: Acting together / hosted

La Paranza is a cooperative formed by a group of young people from Rione Sanità, a neighborhood in Naples. Since 2006 the cooperative has started to manage and valorize a large network of Paleochristian catacombs that lie underneath the neighborhood. Until 2000, those catacombs (belonging to the Catholic Church and, as archeological areas, under the protection of the Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage) were completely abandoned and in very bad conditions. The rector of the overlying church stimulated some of the young people of the neighborhood to take care of the area, trying to keep it partially clean and leading guided tours on demand.

As a result, in 2006 the visitor flow increased, thus pushing the young volunteers to become a cooperative and to broaden the activities also in the neighborhood. After a lot of resistance from the local authorities, the cooperative, together with another cultural association engaged in the city renewal and in combating criminality (l'Altra Napoli onlus) was awarded by Fondazione con il Sud a 500,000 Euros grant to restore and promote the San Gaudioso and San Gennaro Catacombs. Another 600,000 Euros were gathered from private donations and the cooperative succeeded to involve local communities and professionals in the renovation of the previously abandoned heritage. In the last nine years, la Paranza has been able to produce remarkable knock-on effects and to attract a large number of visitors, 40.000 in 2014.

http://www.catacombedinapoli.it

3.2.4   Portugal – The Portuguese Association of Archaeologists

Wilcox/Simon: Acting together

The Portuguese Association of Archaeologists, created in 1863, is one of the oldest civic cultural heritage association created in Europe. Within the context of longstanding and extremely consistent citizen participation, over the years it has engaged in the protection, but also in the promotion and management of cultural heritage. The Association has been, among

many other things, the first one to organize lists of monuments to be legally protected, and since the XIX century up to present manages one of the most emblematic monuments and museums in Lisbon, the Carmo Church. In 1994-1995 it played an important role in the successful campaign for the preservation of the Pre-historic Rock Art complex of the Coa Valley, now classified by UNESCO as World Heritage.

The Association is completely independent of the State and does not receive any public subsidy or grant. It is the best and most inspiring example of how the so-called "civil society" can play a part in the formulation of public policies.

http://www.arqueologos.pt/p_aapen.html

http://www.museuarqueologicodocarmo.pt/p_museuen.html

4   Extended case studies: Approaches to participatory governance in cultural heritage

The extended case studies are projects towards the far right of our framework (the top of Wilcox's and Simon's participation frameworks: co-creation and hosted projects) of which we had the opportunity to connect with stakeholders to study their status and development.

TITLE OF PROJECT	**Geheugen van Oost (Memories of the East)**
COUNTRY	The Netherlands
TYPE OF HERITAGE	Intangible heritage, stories
SIMON/WILCOX CLASSIFICATION	Hosted project, acting together (started as co-creative project)
ADMINISTRATIVE/INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL	Local

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The project Geheugen van Oost (GvO) aims to collect everyday memories and stories from people living in the eastern neighbourhoods of Amsterdam. Their stories paint a lively picture of the neighbourhood.

GvO is both a website and a community of practice and interest in the East Amsterdam.

INITIATOR

GvO is initiated by the Amsterdam Museum early 2002 in the context of an exhibition about the East of Amsterdam. To create a place for all stories about the neighbourhood, the museum developed a website where volunteers would upload stories from citizens. The website was launched in 2003. The Amsterdam Museum worked together with Buurtonline, a network of locations where special interest groups can learn computer skills (the elderly, women, unemployed, migrants).

When the exhibition ended in 2004, the Amsterdam Museum continued with the website, which is still operational today.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

GvO is funded and supported by the Amsterdam Museum and a variety of local public organisations and funds.

STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

The main stakeholders of GvO are the Amsterdam Museum, citizens in East Amsterdam and volunteers of the community.

In the 13 years GvO has existed, the relationship between these stakeholders has shifted, as researcher Mike de Kreek (2014) points out. Initially, it can be considered a participatory project originating from the Amsterdam Museum. Next, it becomes a hosted project, supported by the

museum. Currently, it can be seen as a self-organised platform run by an independent editorial committee and volunteers. Various local interest groups participate in GvO.

DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES

Geheugen van Oost (GvO) is a website and community of practice, bringing together memories and stories from people living in the East of Amsterdam. Initiated in 2002 by the Amsterdam Museum for a temporary exhibition, the platform has since been taken over by its community and continues to thrive. Currently the website presents over 2,500 memories and 20,000 comments, contributed by over 7,000 people.

GvO is run by an editorial board of volunteers. They collect the memories, for instance through interviews, add images and context and upload them to the website. The organisational structure of the platform has evolved throughout the years, changing from 'participatory' (the Amsterdam Museum and Buurtonline invited volunteers to contribute, 2001-2004), to supporting (the community ran the project itself with significant support from the founding partners, 2004-2009), to the current state of self-organising, where the volunteers are in full control of the platform, its editorial choices, etc.

Throughout its 13-year history, the platform has always published a minimum number of memories and received a growing number of comments per year. After the initial 'buzz' of the exhibition, there was a little lull in the memories being contributed until 2010. Ever since, there has been an increase in the amount of memories that has been added per year. This increase in online participation has been paralleled by a decrease in the diversity of the content. According to researcher Mike de Kreek this is related to the fact volunteers are biased towards documenting their specific interests and hobbies.

Apart from the website and community activities, GvO occasionally creates other publications.

STRENGHTS, WEAKNESSES, CHALLENGES, SUSTAINABILITY

The Geheugen van Oost is a remarkable initiative. There are very few participatory websites that have existed for over a decade and have remained active and relevant throughout their entire history. On top of that, there are very few museum-initiated communities that exist for so many years either. This longevity prepares the initiative for the future, as it can use its rich archive, lively community and independent status to attract new contributors, new volunteers and funding.

The editorial board of volunteers brings with it a bias towards certain memories and stories. As Mike de Kreek (2014) points out, the group is not representative of the entire population of East Amsterdam. Certain topics, time periods and neighbourhoods get more focus than others. Additionally, the platform primarily tends to attract elderly people who grew up in East Amsterdam. Such biases can alienate new contributors and volunteers from the platform, as they may feel the platform does not represent them or the neighbourhood they live in.

Copying the success of the platform to other parts of Amsterdam has proven difficult. A similar initiative by the Amsterdam Museum for West Amsterdam, a part of town comparable in size to East Amsterdam, has yielded far fewer contributions and isn't as lively as GvO.

PUBLISHED INFO, WEBSITE

www.geheugenvanoost.nl

Kreek, M. de. (2014) Evolving Empowerment in an Online Community Collecting Memories of Amsterdam East. *Challenges and Solutions. CIRN Prato Conference 2014.* Eds, Larry Stillman, Tom Denison, Centre for Community and Social Informatics, Faculty of IT, Monash University. ISBN: 978-0-9874652-3-8

Kreek, M. de. (2011). Multilevel participation within on-line collections of local memories as a practice of cultural citizenship. *In Digital Strategies for Cultural Heritage 2011.* Rotterdam: Digital Heritage Netherlands. Retrieved from http://kennisbank.hva.nl/nl/record/445183

TITLE OF PROJECT	*Giovani per il territorio (Young people for the territory).* **A call for innovative ideas for the valorization and management of cultural heritage resources addressed to young people's organisations in the region Emilia Romagna**
COUNTRY	Italy
TYPE OF HERITAGE	Built heritage, urban spaces
SIMON/WILCOX CLASSIFICATION	Hosted project/Supporting independent community interests/initiatives
ADMINISTRATIVE /INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL	Regional, municipal

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Giovani per il territorio (Young people for the territory) is an open call for projects launched by the Institute of Cultural Heritage of the Region Emilia Romagna to:

- promote and disseminate a positive attitude and an active engagement with regard to the protection and valorization of cultural heritage resources at local level

- engage young people in the exploration of their territory to identify and take care of cultural heritage resources

- promote active citizenship among young people in devising innovative and creative ways to use and manage cultural heritage resources and collaborate with other players at local level

INITIATOR

Istituto Beni Culturali Regione Emilia-Romagna

SOURCE OF FUNDS

A grant is provided by the Istituto Beni Culturali of the Region Emilia-Romagna to the winners of the open competition:

2012   12,000 Euro for the two projects approved (6,000 Euro per project)

2013   24,000 Euro for the four projects approved (6,000 Euro per project)

2014   60,000 Euros for the six projects approved (10,000 Euro per project)

In the 2014 call, each applicant project was required to find matching funds for a minimum of 2.000 Euros

STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

- Young people's associations comprised of at least 50% individuals who are younger than 35 yrs of age

- Owners of the cultural resources featuring in the projects (foundations, municipalities, etc.)

- Other stakeholders

TIMEFRAME

Started in 2012 and ongoing

2012   Launch of the first experimental call open to subjects in the area of the Forlì province

2013   Launch of the call open to subjects in the areas of the Reggio Emilia and Ferrara provinces

2014   Launch of the call open to subjects in the whole region Emilia Romagna

DESCRIPTION (actions, methods, products, outcomes, major achievements)

'Giovani per il territorio' (Young people for the territory) is an initiative funded by the Institute for Cultural Heritage of the Region Emilia Romagna, which aims to involve young people's organisations to valorise and manage cultural heritage resources located in the region. In 2012 the Institute of Cultural Heritage of the Region Emilia Romagna launched the first call, open to associations or informal groups of young people aged 18-35. The scheme was first experimented with in the province of Forlì and relied on funds to finance two projects with a grant of 6.000 Euros each. In 2012 twenty eight applications were submitted to the Institute for funding. In the following years a growing interest in the initiative and the intention to raise the quality of the applications, convinced the Institute of Cultural Heritage to widen the scope of the initiative to the whole regional area and raise the budget to 60,000 Euros in order to fund 6 projects with 10,000 Euros each. A pre-requisite then became the formal involvement of the legal owner of the cultural heritage resource at stake and the provision of matching funds by the owners themselves for a minimum of 2,000 Euros. In 2014 58 applications were received.

The criteria for the awarding of the grant in the 2014 calls were:

- characteristics of the applicant and coherence of its profile with the objectives of the call (up to 5 points);

- innovation and originality of the proposal, also with regard to the dissemination plan (up to 5 points);

- clarity and feasibility of the project (up to 5 points);

- possibility of future developments (sustainability) (up to 5 points);

- number of young people involved and level of their involvement (up to 5 points);

- capacity of the project to involve and aggregate other players in the area and level of their engagement (up to 5 points);

- amount of the co-funding secured (up to 5 points).

The projects funded by the different calls were:

2012 Call

ATR Contemporary: a space for the performing arts. The project aimed to enhance the former depot of ATR buses (a rationalist building built in 1935 and dismissed in 1998) and open it for a series of events. The intent was to create a center for performing and contemporary arts of European standards in the city center.

Sowing ... Orselli! The project aimed to enhance the green area "Gardens Orselli" in the center of Forlì. The purpose was to create an urban garden in the public park, encouraging citizens to rediscover local agricultural traditions and bringing back a kind of sustainable agriculture in the city. Schools, young people, families and the elderly were involved in social events and in the management and care of the garden.

2013 Call

Festival of Paulownie. The project aimed to enhance a park located near the train station of Reggio Emilia through the organization of cultural events and the implementation of workshops addressed to 0 to 18 year olds and their families.

Streets of Liberty - The origins of Europe in the Resistance in Reggio Emilia. The project aimed to enhance the heritage related to the history of anti-fascism and resistance: monuments, buildings, etc., by designing car, bicycle, and pedestrian paths to rediscover the recent history of the fight for liberation from fascism.

Backup of a square. The project wanted to involve different partners and young people in Ferrara in documenting the history of the Trento and Trieste square as a privileged place of encounter, exchange and aggregation via historical research and the collection of stories, memories, photographs, etc.

Garden of crossed destinies .The project aimed to produce a series of theatrical performances entitled 'The Garden of Crossed Destinies' having as theme a drama inspired by the historical memory and social changes which took place in the Borough named "Garden". The performance was preceded by a drama workshop which involved 25 young people between 18 and 35 years and former offenders -actors of the theatre workshop from the prison of Ferrara.

2014 Call

Hortus Conclusus: visit of the St. Paul's gardens on the evolution of the city. The religious complex of the Benedictine monastery of San Paolo in Parma is a vast urban area near the cathedral. The project is about reviving the ancient garden pertaining to it via the creation of a trail within the garden with panels and multimedia content accessible via the QR Codes and enriched by visual, olfactory and sound elements.

Open building site 2015 (see detailed case study). Through the project, the Association Social Theatre of Gualtieri aims to maintain the theatre though the engagement of the citizens themselves in the restructuring of the building. A unique experience in Italy in the recovery of a heritage for the common good .

Young people for the fortress: a past for our future. The young members of the Association take care of the management of the castle complex in Montefiorino and its spaces, of the promotion of the fortress also via a website, of guided visits, etc. The project also shows evidence of the will to be involved by local tourist operators (hotels, restaurants, B & Bs, Hostels), craftsmen and small agricultural producers, to build a network capable of bringing economic benefits to the entire area.

A castle and its routes: The project includes: an exhibition on the history of the castle of Calendasco, the estate of Caledon and the Francigena Route; tourist packages and nature

trails, walking and cycling along the Po river; a website for the promotion of the territory; the organization of the first "Sigerico Marathon", the realization of a medieval dinner on the square of the castle.

Territory and memory. Tavolicci, is a small mountain hamlet where on July 22, 1944 64 civilians, mostly women, old people and children, were brutally massacred. The project wants to set up five teams of young people accompanied by experts to take care of the memory of the place. Each group will deliver a different product: footpath; a documentation centre; a cultural program for the summer season; an educational kit for schools, and a plan for communication and information.

Village Colle Ameno: roots of a future: the village was developed in the XVIII eighteenth century as a small "ideal city" consisting of a villa and a village with artisan workshops, a print shop, a majolica factory, a church, a hospital and a cultural academy. In 1944 the village was turned into a prison camp by the Nazis. The restoration project was started in the 1990's. Among other things, the project aims to rediscover the ceramic making tradition through the activation of specialized workshops; restore the printing tradition for the production of art books, stage events related to food quality, create a website for the permanent promotion of the village. The projects funded through the 2014 call have to deliver their activities between February and December 2015.

STRENGHTS, WEAKNESSES, CHALLENGES, SUSTAINABILITY

'Young people for the territory' is a very good example of participatory governance of cultural heritage resources stimulated by a regional authority in a top down mode, and involving players at different levels: municipalities (which are very often the owners of the cultural assets are often the object of the intervention), associations, civil society, other players on the territory. It has been very much welcomed and has succeeded in stimulating the initiative and creativity of young people with regard to possible ways of using, enhancing and managing cultural heritage resources in the area where they live.

The initiative is now in its third year, so it is possible to tentatively carry out an appraisal of its functioning and impact. Since its inception in 2012, the scheme has been changed and improved in a number of ways:

- After two years, the call was open to the whole region in order to receive more and better quality proposals. In 2012 and 2013 the call addressed organisations located in the capital cities of three different provinces, therefore excluding smaller towns or centres, which often prove to be very lively on the one hand, but needing external impetus and support to put their ideas into practice on the other.

- In the first two calls the focus was on the valorization, now it is on both valorization and management of cultural heritage assets.

- As a consequence, it became essential to guarantee the involvement of the owner of the cultural heritage resource, which now has to be formalized at the moment of the submission of the application (in the previous calls the support of the municipality in which the heritage was located was gained via the formal signing of an agreement between the Institute of Cultural

Heritage and the Chair for Culture of the Municipality) This gives more strength to the proposal and creates a commitment on the side of the owner (which can be a municipality, a foundation, or another type of owner) to sustain the project once the funding is over.

- Likewise, the request of co-funding for a minimum of 2.000 Euros per project to compliment the regional grant of 10.000 Euros was introduced to share the responsibility and show a real commitment. In some cases the funding offered by a municipality exactly matched the grant provided by the regional call.

Most of the initiatives did not exist before the regional funding was made available and the call was launched, or they were very much at a beginning stage. Therefore it can be said that the top down regional initiative was essential to instigate the projects, all of which are in essence examples of participatory governance of cultural heritage resources. It will be interesting to follow them up to see what happens after the 10 months funding, whether new models for the shared management and valorisation of the cultural assets are put in place and what kinds of agreements, if any, will be established to sustain the projects and give them continuity over the course of time.

PUBLISHED INFO, WEBSITE

http://ibc.regione.emilia-romagna.it/istituto/progetti/progetti-1/giovani-per-il-territorio

TITLE OF PROJECT	**Cantiere Aperto (Open Building site)**
COUNTRY	Italy
TYPE OF HERITAGE	Monuments, Theatre
SIMON/WILCOXCLASSIFICATION	Hosted project - Supporting independent community interests/initiatives
ADMINISTRATIVE /INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL	Municipal

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The history of the reopening of the theatre in Gualtieri began in 2006 when a group of young people went through the doors of the construction site which had occupied the building for nearly three decades. They fell in love with the space and decided to make it accessible again, without any economic support and, initially, without formal permission from the Gualtieri Municipality to which the building belongs.

They set themselves several objectives:

- recovery and restoration of the space
- involvement of citizens in the town and in the neighbouring areas to carry out the actual restoration work or contribute in other ways
- reopening of the theatre for performances of various kinds
- programming of a theatre season for the forthcoming years

INITIATOR

A group of young people in their twenties, who later gave life to an Association "Teatro Sociale Gualtieri" in 2009, thereby gaining legal status.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Between 2006 and 2009 the activities undertaken by the young people's group were entirely self-funded. In 2009 the Municipality intervened with some works to guarantee the safety of the building in which performances had started taking place. Currently the Municipality makes available a standard financial contribution of 10,000 Euros per year and puts the Association in touch with other possible sponsors who also contribute an average of 20,000 euros/year, usually provided in kind (materials, experts' advice, etc.). These monies are spent to continue the restoration and refurbishment of the building. The Association has attempted to ascertain the cost of their own voluntary work over the years by using standard costs provided by the local Chamber of Commerce. The outcome is quite stunning.

Since 2011, the work of the Association has been valued in the area of 180,000 Euros against 20,000 Euros of the Municipality's financial contribution. The ratio of voluntary works versus institutional investment depends on the work undertaken. For the restoration of the stage, for example, the work of the Association was worth 100,000 Euros against 10,000 Euros of the Municipality's financial contribution. For the new security doors it was 50,000 Euros from the Association vs 10,000 Euros from the Municipality.

STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

Initially the young people's Association "Teatro Sociale Gualtieri" and the citizens of the town, later the Municipality, the Province of Reggio Emilia, the Region Emilia Romagna (funds have been provided in 2015 through the "Young people for the territory" scheme), a Bank Foundation, local companies and sponsors.

TIMEFRAME

2006 and ongoing

DESCRIPTION (actions, methods, products, outcomes and summary of major achievements)

The theatre in Gualtieri, a small town in the province of Reggio Emilia, was built in 1905 and called "Sociale" at the time, since it was managed by the "Società dei Palchettisti" (Company of those renting or owning theatre boxes). In the 1980s it was closed and remained under restoration, so to say, since then. In 2006 a group of young people in their twenties decided to intervene in the theatre in order to re-open it and bring it back to life.

At the beginning their work was carried out almost clandestinely with the implicit, but tacit, approval of the Municipality, to which the monument belongs. They worked voluntarily and funded themselves until 2008, when they invited the Municipality to recognise their achievements and asked them to provide accessibility to the venue for 100 people and to provide an electric wiring system, in order to launch the first summer season. The theatre was therefore reopened in 2009. The same year, the group of young people formally constituted an Association, "Teatro Sociale Gualtieri", made up of 16 individuals, all younger than 35, 7 of which sit on the executive board which decides both the artistic programming – with concerts and other performances taking place between April and October, due to the lack of central heating - and the progress of the restoration works. The latter are carried out with the active and voluntary involvement of the inhabitants of Gualtieri or of the neighbouring areas, mostly aged 20 to 40, who meet once or twice a week in the period January-April and October-December for a total of 30 working evenings a year. On the average 20 people convene each time. These working get-togethers turn also into social events. This has strengthened relationships among individuals and in general has created a sense of ownership of the theatre among the people living in the small town of Gualtieri, which prides itself of being a unique experience in Italy where the collective recovery of heritage-as-common-good has become a reality.

The project is ongoing and long term, with many areas of the theatre still to be restored - in particular the main hall, and an adjacent area for rehearsals and artist residencies - but with increasing external appreciation and recognition which also translates into ad hoc funding, like the grant provided by the Institute of Cultural Heritage of the Region Emilia Romagna (see "Young people for the territory"), matched by the Municipality of Gualtieri for the same amount.

STRENGHTS, WEAKNESSES, SUSTAINABILITY

This is a very good example of a bottom up participatory project where the institutional actor and owner of the building, the Municipality, was nearly forced to become part of the project and contribute funding.

In 2009 there was a formal recognition of the activities carried out until then, with the signature of an agreement between the Municipality and the Association, by which the latter was allowed to use the building for free. However there is no formal document which guarantees the yearly financial contribution of the Municipality.

Right now the young people's Association is pursuing two objectives:

a) continuing the "Open building site" project, i.e. the restoration work on the theatre through voluntary work;

b) establishing a cultural enterprise, i.e. a centre for theatre production, thereby creating jobs.

With regard to the social impact of the project, it should be underlined that one of the most important outcomes, apart from the creation of a closely knit volunteer community and strong ties amongst its members, has been the bringing together the theatre into collaboration with individuals who would have never done so under different circumstances. The practical engagement and manual work of a group of visionary young people who certainly can't be regarded only as "intellectuals" has aroused the interest of many in the small town of Gualtieri (nearly 7.000 inhabitants), where not much happens, especially in the long winter nights, when the theatre opens for work as building site.

In terms of sustainability, over the years this project has attracted resources in addition to those provided by the Municipality, either through local sponsors or via grants awarded by other authorities, the Regional government, etc. The Association is in any case always busy in fundraising activities.

PUBLISHED INFO, WEBSITE

www.teatrosocialegualtieri.it

http://www.teatrosocialegualtieri.it/cantiere-aperto/

https://vimeo.com/88133089

http://www.teatrosocialegualtieri.it/cantiere-aperto/

TITLE OF PROJECT	Museomix: giving space to the community
COUNTRY	France
TYPE OF HERITAGE	Museums
SIMON/WILCOX CLASSIFICATION	
ADMINISTRATIVE /INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL	Museum

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Bringing museums and the creative society together is the primary goal of Museomix, which functions as a cultural co-creative laboratory, promoting the idea of an open, participative museum that is part of a wider network. Museomix is based on 5 principles for "remixing the museum":

- the museum as a forum: promoting sharing and exchange with the public

- the museum as an open space

- the museum as a laboratory: experimenting and testing new mediation prototypes.

- the museum as a network: sharing attitudes, knowledge, experiences

- participated governance: promoting teamwork and independent thinking, combining the talents of different contributors.

The aim is to create a "technological-cultural" community mixing individuals interested in museums and in new technologies to develop concrete projects. By collaborating with people from diverse backgrounds and enabling them to create and participate in museum life, museums open themselves up further to new audiences. Aside from connecting different communities, Museomix is also intended to facilitate collaborations between large and small institutions.

INITIATORS

The founders of Museomix are: Samuel Bausson, webmaster at the Toulouse Museum for five years, expert in innovation and information technology at the service of cultural mediation and editor of mixeum.net blog; Julien Dorra expert in digital creativity; nod-A, a team of engineers, designers and makers; Buzzeum, a digital strategy agency for museums and the Centre Erasme, a digital innovation centre in Lyon.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Each Museomix event is funded individually by gathering resources at local level via sponsorships, in kind contributions, volunteering, etc. The cost of each Museomix can vary between 30.000 to 50.000 Euros or more if all contributions, also the non-monetary ones, are taken into account.

STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

The museum hosting the event and a wide audience of designers, artists, inventors, tinkerers, curious, people interested in exploring new ways of using cultural institutions. For each

Museomix event, facilitators and technical staff are available to enable people to explore the museum and develop concerted and negotiated ideas collectively. This approach relies on volunteerism and people are motivated to participate in an exceptional adventure.

TIMEFRAME
Since 2011 and ongoing

DESCRIPTION (actions, methods, products, outcomes and summary of major achievements)
In the participating institutions, Museomix generates an annual event, called "makeathon", which takes place usually in 6-7 museums each year and is dedicated to new forms of creativity and digital mediation. The "makeathon" is hosted by the museum and runs over three days. It brings together participants with different profiles to design and prototype innovative experiences using digital and new media. Teams of six work together to invent a prototype in the field of mediation that offers the public a new approach to a selected subject. These teams are made up of people interested in museums, among them mediators, designers, developers, graphic designers, communicators, artists, writers and scientists. The aim is to invite those that are usually museum visitors, but not necessarily, to imagine all the solutions to a problem, inventing new forms of mediation and offering new relationships with the institution, thereby placing innovation at the core of the museum process. The motto of Museomix is "People make museums". The Museomix project was first conceived in France and has since been exported to cultural institutions in several other countries.

STRENGHTS, WEAKNESSES, SUSTAINABILITY
Museomix aims to change the nature of the museum in terms of mediation and governance.
Each Museomix is a unique experience, therefore it is not easy to account for its outcomes in general terms. Museums participate in it out of curiosity, without pre-defined objectives and with no commitment to deliver specific results or products. This is what differentiates Museomix from any other service provision or mediation activity which aim to produce digital tools.
Each museum has its own experience in connection with its history, its context and project. As a result of being involved in Musoemix, some museums change the way they work and become more innovative, some allow themselves to be more experimental, while others become more comfortable with digital technologies. Sometimes it is the meeting with partners and sponsors which constitutes a new experience which is then extended, other times prototypes are created which will become permanent. Those who take part in Museomix have no obligation to produce results and that is what makes the creative project free and open.

PUBLISHED INFO, WEBSITE
http://www.museomix.org/en

TITLE OF PROJECT	"Le città come beni comuni" – "Cities as common goods"
COUNTRY	Italy
TYPE OF HERITAGE	Built heritage, civic spaces
SIMON/WILCOX CLASSIFICATION	Acting together
ADMINISTRATIVE /INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL	Municipal

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The project's main objective is to achieve citizens' participation with regard to the care of common goods through the creation of mechanisms to support active citizenship. This is done in a twofold way: on the one hand making the functioning of the municipal administration more transparent by publicising those documents (regulations, procedures, etc.) which can encourage citizens to get active in the caretaking of common goods; on the other by experimenting with management and governance models in three areas of the city, selected with the full involvement of boroughs.

INITIATOR

Labsus – Laboratory for subsidiarity

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Fondazione del Monte di Bologna e Ravenna. In addition, resources have been found thanks to the contacts with citizens, stakeholders, companies and associations generated by the project.

STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

- Labsus – Laboratory for subsidiarity is an association created in 2006 to promote and disseminate a new model of society based on horizontal subsidiarity.
- Centro Antartide active since 1992 in the field of education and environmental and social communication
- Municipality of Bologna
- Fondazione del Monte di Bologna e Ravenna is a bank foundation whose statutory task is to contribute to the development of local communities, to scientific research and to the safeguard of artistic and cultural heritage
- Citizens

TIMEFRAME

2012 and ongoing

DESCRIPTION (actions, methods, products, outcomes and summary of major achievements)

In 2001 the concept of "horizontal subsidiarity" was introduced in the Italian Constitution. Article 118 now reads "The State, Regions, Metropolitan cities, Provinces and Municipalities encourage the autonomous initiative of citizens, individually or in associations, to carry out

activities of general interest on the basis of the principle of subsidiarity." This principle, which allows to move from a top down and hierarchical understanding of the public administration to a model where it is the community itself which takes care of its surroundings and of its city, with the support of the public authorities, was embraced by Labsus – Laboratory for subsidiarity which launched the project "Cities as common goods" in Bologna, with the agreement and support of the Municipality.

The project comprised the following actions:

- mapping of "active citizenship" forces (projects, groups) present in the three experimenting boroughs of the city of Bologna

- training of the Municipality of Bologna's civil servants engaged in the project

- support to the coordination of the activities by the municipal administration

- facilitation of the projects undertaken by citizens

- involvement of schools

Example: Borough Santo Stefano

This is a very interesting and rich area from the artistic and historical point of view and with the presence of strong 'active citizenship' groups. Heritage in the borough includes: the Church of Santo Stefano, the complex of Baraccano, the garden Lavinia Fontana, the house of the poet Giosuè Carducci, the Risorgimento Museum, the Women's Library, the house of the painter Giorgio Morandi, recently transformed into a museum. Due to the presence of arcades, another stakeholder is the State Superintendence for architectural heritage. This district was identified as a possible area of experimentation in accordance with the president of the borough.

The civic associations present in the area are: a group of citizens who spontaneously got together to maintain the Carducci square and called themselves "I love Santo Stefano", a migrant association, a group of lawyers ('Lawyers in the building site') wanting to become active with regard to the removal of graffiti, a group in charge of the cleaning of the arcades' pavements, the Women's centre, an association specialising in organising collective events for the "fun" cleaning of the streets, some residents and businesses in the area, representatives of the local schools, a group of adolescents, etc.

Meetings were organised to support these groups in elaborating and prioritising projects for the cleaning and maintenance of the area, to manage the Baraccano and the Lavinia Fontana gardens, to raise awareness among residents and schools.

The initiatives undertaken regarded:

- Qualification of the area in accordance with the municipality and the State Superintendency, including preparatory activities (photographic campaign and mapping of the area, executive plan), the cleaning of the pavements and the removal of graffiti. These activities are now carried out regularly and fundraising to buy the necessary materials is also part of the plan.

- Management and maintenance of the garden Lavinia Fontana thanks to the joining of forces of the local migrants association, a group of residents, the University of Bologna and the Women's centre, supported by an agreement with the Municipality of Bologna.

- Educational activities in schools promoted by the Lawyers' association to raise awareness on the themes of legality and protection of common goods. One of the topics will be active citizenship, legality and graffiti.

STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, SUSTAINABILITY

The principle of subsidiarity introduced in the Italian Constitution in 2001, resulted in a profound change in the paradigm that traditionally regulated the relationship between institutions and citizens because it not only recognized the legitimacy of citizens in undertaking independent initiatives for pursuing objectives of general interest, but it entrusted it to the institutions to promote such initiatives. As a consequence, the Municipality of Bologna established a regulatory framework to make the collaboration between the city and its inhabitants for the care of public goods a permanent policy.

The approach chosen to write the regulations (Regolamento sulla collaborazione tra cittadini e amministrazione per la cura e la rigenerazione dei beni comuni urbani) was innovative and inclusive of the citizens themselves and was developed through workshops and experiences of participation involving individual citizens and associations during two years of field work in three boroughs.

The "Regolamento" was made available to the association of Italian Municipalites and has now been adopted by other cities. It is accessible at http://www.comune.bologna.it/comunita/beni-comuni.

The scheme is regarded as being quite successful: the first call launched by the Municipality to prompt ideas for the care of common goods received 84 proposals; in the first two years of operation there were 600 volunteers and about 21,000 citizens engaged, and 32 schools involved. In the first two years of operation, 54 areas of the city were maintained, cleaned and animated with cultural events.

PUBLISHED INFO, WEBSITE

http://www.cittabenicomuni.it/bologna/

TITLE OF PROJECT	Regional network of Thematic Museums of Piraeus Bank Group Cultural Foundation
COUNTRY	Greece
TYPE OF HERITAGE	Museums
SIMON/WILCOX	Acting together
ADMINISTRATIVE /INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL	Regional

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The Piraeus Bank Group Cultural Foundation (PIOP) is a non-profit institution operating under private law that represents the Culture Pole of the Piraeus Bank Group. PIOP aims at safeguarding technology and traditional crafts, a neglected domain of Greek culture, becoming a reliable and constant mediator for the preservation and promotion of pre-industrial and industrial heritage.

The basic statutory goals of the Foundation are:

a) to record and promote Greece's cultural heritage and identity,

b) to preserve the traditional, artisanal and industrial technology of our country,

c) to link culture with the environment and sustainable development.

These goals are achieved through:

a) the creation and management of a network of thematic museums of technology in the Greek provinces, where the specific nature of production in the corresponding region is highlighted, focusing on the three notions of *People-Environment-Culture,*

b) the implementation of research programmes and the publication of academic works,

c) the organisation of a variety of academic and cultural actions,

d) the implementation of educational programmes and activities,

e) the participation in the public dialogue for the definition of the strategies to be followed in the area of culture,

f) the collaboration with Greek and international institutions of recognised repute.

INITIATOR

Piraeus Bank Group Cultural Foundation (PIOP)

SOURCE OF FUNDS

In accordance with its statutes, the operational costs of PIOP, including those of its Museums, are covered by the Piraeus Bank Group. At the same time, PIOP pursues the co-financing of certain projects through national and European programmes. The cost of creating the museums is essentially covered by European programmes (II and III Community Support Frameworks, National Strategic Reference Framework) and supplemented by Piraeus Bank.

STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

The Piraeus Bank, Piraeus Bank Group Cultural Foundation (PIOP), The Greek Ministry of Culture, Local Authorities in the areas where the museums are opened

TIMEFRAME

The first of the seven museums opened in 1990, two more are expected to open in 2016

DESCRIPTION (actions, methods, products, outcomes and summary of major achievements)

Seven technological thematic museums have been created by the Piraeus Bank: the Silk Museum (1990, renovation works in 2009), the Open-air Water-power Museum (1997), the Museum of the Olive and Greek Olive-Oil (2002), the Museum of Industrial Olive-Oil Production in Lesvos (2006), the N. & S. Tsalapatas Rooftile and Brickworks Museum (2007), the Museum of Marble Crafts (2008) and the Environment Museum Stymphalia (2010), whilst two more are on the way, the Mastic Gum Museum on the island of Chios and of the Museum of Silvercrafting in Ioannina (Epirus).

These museums highlight distinctive productive activities, representative of each region, and, through their outreach activities, become a point of reference for the local population. Each of the thematic museums highlights the diverse aspects of a productive activity that was based on the use of a natural resource, upheld the local/regional economy and stamped the identity of the corresponding region.

The museological approach aims to:

a) restore the "architectural shell"/the building as well as the mechanical equipment and the nexus of tools associated with this particular productive activity,

b) record the know-how, the production chain,

c) preserve and valorise the human element, the intangible aspect of Industrial Heritage

The Foundation's Museum Network has been established in regional Greece, on the basis of PIOP's continuous and fruitful collaboration with local authorities and the Greek State. The museums created and managed by PIOP usually do not belong to the Foundation itself but, rather, their ownership is in the hands of public entities (the Ministry of Culture, local government, etc.). The building in which each individual museum is going to be housed is ceded for use to PIOP for 50 years in application of the Law on national bequests.

To this end, a case-by-case Programme Contract is signed between the entities concerned. In this contract, PIOP undertakes the commitment of funding the functioning of the Museum and the responsibility of managing it for fifty years, while the details of concession, the responsibilities of the contracting parties and the composition of the Monitoring Committee as regards the Museum's functioning are also laid down.

As the implementing agent, PIOP undertakes both the technical (creation/restoration of the building) and museological (museum's content) part of the project, which are implemented through contracting, following a public tendering process or through in-house procurement.

For managing the Museum Network PIOP has elaborated a model of dual management approach (central services with regional antennas), so as to ensure:

1. the high-level/specialized personnel in the field of cultural management of all types of required disciplines,

2. the quality of the services offered,

3. the greatest possible effectiveness,

4. the minimization of fixed costs, and

5. the combination of two apparently opposite tendencies: the application of a common policy and common style on the one hand, and the valorisation of each museum's particular nature on the other.

As a result, the Foundation's central services are responsible for the scientific and technical support and also cover the administrative, accounting and secretarial needs of the Network and at the same time monitor and ensure its maintenance and valorisation. A "Museum Manager" is assigned to each Museum (regional antenna) who is responsible for the operational aspects of the Museum, the promotion of local collaborations with other cultural and educational entities and the preparation and submission of proposals regarding the annual work programme of the Museum. Personnel members in charge of the reception area, security and maintenance/cleaning are in the direct employ of each regional museum, hired among the local society and thus constituting a link with each community.

The Piraeus Bank wholly finances the functioning of each individual museum, while PIOP has the full management responsibility. On average, the income generated by the entrance tickets, museum shops, refreshment areas and multipurpose halls do not cover more than 30% of the operating costs, even when the number of visitors reaches 100,000 annually, as roughly 65% of the visitors (in such categories as students, elderly people over 65 years, cardholders of ICOM and of ICOM, teaching personnel in the educational system, personnel of PIOP and Piraeus Bank, people with disabilities, etc.) have either free entrance rights or reduced ticket rates in the framework of the policy of the Piraeus Bank for Corporate Social Responsibility. The rest of the expenses are covered through the Piraeus Bank's annual subsidy in favour of the Foundation.

The management model, already evaluated by its application for a period ranging from five to ten years depending on the Museum, is proven to be effective, sustainable and executable by a wide range of cultural institutions. It should be noted that the model supports local development initiatives which have been assessed as supportive for social cohesion, as well as for the enhancement of cultural tourism. Finally the model has facilitated the transforming of each Museum of the network into a cultural cell for the respective hosting city, practically an "open" cultural space of the city, thus supporting the mobilization of local people towards cultural and educational activities.

STRENGHTS, WEAKNESSES, SUSTAINABILITY

This is a very interesting example for the creation and management of museums in the Greek regions, while also ensuring sustainability and supporting regional development. It should be

noted that instead of a simple sponsorship, Piraeus Bank opted for a permanent and continuous involvement in the sector of culture, a stance that is obviously more substantial as regards the real support of both the cultural affairs and the economy and society to the development needs of regional Greece.

It is a case of a unique, far-reaching cultural intervention, which allows the Piraeus Bank Group to decisively mark the «culture» question with its own stamp: through PIOP, a large financial institution plays an active part and consolidates itself in public opinion by investing in the country's cultural affairs. The Foundation's activities are a means for Piraeus Bank, which created it, to exercise an explicit cultural policy, fully aligned to the demanding museum qualifications set by the Ministry of Culture, adapted to the needs of local societies and investing on the cooperation with them.

Winner of Europa Nostra Prize for dedicated service 2012

PUBLISHED INFO, WEBSITE

www.piop.gr

TITLE OF PROJECT	CREATIVE PEOPLE AND PLACES
COUNTRY	United Kingdom
TYPE OF HERITAGE	Built and Immaterial heritage, urban spaces, environment
SIMON/WILCOX CLASSIFICATION	Co-creative projects/Supporting independent community interests/initiatives[5]
ADMINISTRATIVE /INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL	National, Local

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Creative People and Places aims to:

- Engage more people from places of least engagement to experience and be inspired by the arts. Communities are empowered to take the lead in shaping local arts provision.

- Uncover both excellence of art and excellence of the process of engaging communities

- Create an environment where the arts and cultural sector can experiment with new approaches to engaging communities.

- Encourage long-term collaborations between local communities and arts organisations, museums, libraries and other partners such as local authorities and the private sector.

INITIATOR

Arts Council

SOURCE OF FUNDS

A grant has been provided by the Arts Council from 2012 to 2014, for a total of £37 million in three years, to 21 places in total. All places have received/will receive grants for three years' worth of activity with monetary value ranging from £625,000 to £3,000,000.

Each applicant project is required to find matching funds for a minimum of 10% of the total costs (also in kind) and must be presented by a consortium.

STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

- Associations, public bodies, privates, citizens resident in the area

- Museums, local libraries, theatres, cultural organisations

- Other stakeholders

TIMEFRAME

2012-2016

2012 first round awarded 7 projects

2012 second round awarded 11 projects

2013-2014 third round awarded 3 projects.

---

[5] The funding program is one of the commissioned grants in the strategic funding program of the UK Arts Council (Lottery funded). The programme awards a grant to organisations to lead a consortium in a small number of places, to develop a programme of arts activity and engagement over three years and within a 10-year vision.

DESCRIPTION (actions, methods, products, outcomes, major achievements)

Only consortia can apply, not single organizations, and projects must be located in one of the areas of low engagement identified by the Arts Council (those areas represent the lowest 20 per cent from the Active People (arts) survey, two-year average percentage). The activity successful applicants are expected to deliver are split into two phases. The first phase of activity (up to six months) is aimed at encouraging successful consortia to focus on developing their partnerships and producing a shared business plan. During this phase, these consortia develop a detailed arts programme and refine their approach to engaging local communities. If all requirements are met, successful applicants proceed to stage two of the programme: the delivery of a 3 year programme of arts and engagement. The assessment criteria for the awarding of the grant were:

- **The proposed activity – meeting the brief (40%):** Quality and feasibility of the proposal, how the community will be involved, what proportion are relevant arts practitioners and arts organisations - as well as community members - involved in the development of the proposal, how far is the applicant testing new and innovative approaches, which legacy, etc.

- **Track record and capacity to deliver – managing the activity (40**%): Demonstration of ability to deliver the project, including, experience of the applicant, organisational capability; experience of encouraging successful collaborations between organisations of different scales; experience of communicating in an accessible way to non-specialists; a model of governance that will support the delivery of the programme, etc.

- **Budget – financial viability (20%)**

The projects funded by the different calls were:

First Round (2012)

1. Places: Boston and South Holland

Consortium members: artsNK (grant recipient), **South Lincs CVS, Lincolnshire Artists Forum**

Grant offer (over three years): £2,592,183

See more at: http://www.transportedart.com/

2. Places: London - Barking and Dagenham

Consortium members: Studio 3 Arts (grant recipient), Arc Theatre, A New Direction, London Borough of Barking and Dagenham, Christ Church Thames View

Grant offer (over three years): £838,500

See more at http://www.creativebd.org.uk/

3. Places: Wansbeck and Blyth Valley

Consortium members: Woodhorn Charitable Trust (grant recipient), Queens Hall Arts, Northumberland College, NHS North of Tyne, Northumberland County Council, Connect4Change

Grant offer (over three years): £2,461,400

See more at http://www.baittime.to/Home

4. Places: Blackpool and Wyre

Consortium members: Blackpool Coastal Housing Ltd (grant recipient), Grand Theatre, Merlin Entertainments Group Ltd, Blackpool Council, Wyre Borough Council

Grant offer (over three years): £3,000,000

See more at http://www.leftcoast.org.uk/

5. Places: Swale and Medway

Consortium members: Swale and Medway Consortium (grant recipient),

LV21, Leysdown Rose tinted, Swale CVS, Medway Voice, Kent Architecture Centre, Creek Creative, Fellow Creative, Swale Borough Council, Medway Council, Kent County Council

Grant offer (over three years): £1,476,000

http://creativepeopleplace.info/

6. Places: Stoke-on-Trent

Consortium members: Stoke-On-Trent and North Staffordshire Theatre Trust Limited (grant recipient),

New Vic Theatre, Partners in Creative Learning, B Arts, Staffordshire University, Brighter Futures

Grant offer (over three years): £2,999,431

http://www.appetitestoke.co.uk/

7. Places: Doncaster

Consortium members: Doncaster Community Arts (DARTS) (grant recipient), Doncaster Culture and Leisure Trust on behalf of Doncaster Performance Venue, Doncaster Voluntary Arts Network (DVAN)

Grant offer (over three years): £2,570,924

http://rightupourstreet.org.uk/

Second Round (end of 2012)

8. Places: Peterborough

Consortium members: Peterborough Culture and Leisure (grant recipient), Creative Peterborough, Metal, Young Lives, Step Up, Voluntary Arts England and Vivacity

Grant offer (over three years): £725,046

http://www.vivacity-peterborough.com/theatres-and-arts/peterborough-presents/

9. Places: London - Hounslow

Consortium members: Watermans (grant recipient), Feltham Arts Association, Hounslow Music Service, Hounslow Community Network, TW4 Community Development Trust, John Laing Integrated Services and LB Hounslow

Grant offer (over three years): £929,079

http://www.watermans.org.uk/impact/impact-and-social-value/current-projects/creative-people-and-places---2013-16.aspx

10. Places: Ashfield, Bolsover, Mansfield and North East Derbyshire

Consortium members: Creswell Heritage Trust (grant recipient), The Prince's Trust, Junction Arts, City Arts (Nottingham), and community representatives from the Bolsover Partnership and NAVO

Grant offer (over three years): £1,500,000

http://junctionarts.org/2014/07/first-art/

11. Places: Corby

Consortium members: Groundwork, Corby, North Northamptonshire (grant recipient), Corby Cube Theatre Trust, Corby Community Arts, Corby Unity, Northamptonshire Enterprise Partnership.

Grant offer (over three years): £1,000,000

https://www.facebook.com/MadeInCorby

12. Places: Sandwell, Walsall and Wolverhampton

Consortium members: Black Country Together CIC (grant recipient), Black Country Councils of Voluntary Service (CVS), Multi-story and Black Country Touring

Grant offer (over three years): £2,000,000

https://creativeblackcountry.wordpress.com/

13. Places: County Durham

Consortium members: Beamish, The Living Museum of the North (grant recipient), East Durham Trust and Forma Arts and Media

Grant offer (over three years): £1,500,000

http://eastdurhamcreates.co.uk/

14. Places: South Tyneside and Sunderland

Consortium members: University of Sunderland (grant recipient), Customs House and the Music and Culture Trust

Grant offer (over three years): £2,000,000

http://theculturalspring.org.uk/

15. Places: Blackburn, Darwen, Burnley, Hyndburn and Pendle

Consortium members: Canal & River Trust (grant recipient), Groundwork Pennine Lancashire Trust, APPL (Arts Partners in Pennine Lancashire) and Barnfield Construction Limited

Grant offer (over three years): £1,984,722

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xITWDZM1WLY&feature=youtu.be

16. Places: St Helens

Other consortium members: Saints Community Development Foundation (grant recipient), Helena Partnerships, FACT (Foundation for Arts and Creative Technology), St Helens Council and St Helens Arts Partnership

Grant offer (over three years): £1,500,000

http://www.heartofglass.org.uk/

17. Places: Kingston upon Hull

Consortium members: Artlink, Hull (grant recipient), Hull Truck Theatre, Volcom, Kingston upon Hull City Council, and Hull and East Yorkshire Community Foundation

Grant offer (over three years): £3,000,000

http://www.rootsandwingshull.co.uk/

18. Places: Kirklees

Consortium members: Lawrence Batley Theatre (grant recipient), We Do (formerly Open Art), Batley Festival Group and Kirklees Council

Grant offer (over three years): £2,000,000

http://www.creativescene.org.uk/

Third Round (2014)

19. Places: Slough

Consortium members: Rifco Arts leading for Slough (grant recipient), YES Your Engagement Slough, Creative Junction CIC, Aik Saath, Resource Productions, SWIPE and Slough Borough Council

Grant offer: £625,000

http://rifcoarts.com/latest-news/rifco-selected-for-creative-people-and-places

20. Place: Luton

Grant recipient: Luton Culture for Luton (grant recipient)

Grant offer: £686,531

Bring Me Sunshine is a springboard for Luton to develop into a dynamic and diverse town with exceptional creativity and innovation. Creative Community Forums will be recruited through Luton's well-established Neighbourhood Governance Networks alongside artists and creative producers. With the support of Creative Leaders and Creative Hub made up of artists and creative industries.

21. Places: Forest Heath and Fenland

Grant recipient: Arts Development East Cambridge for Fenland

Grant offer: £964,218

Market Place will connect seven market towns across Forest Heath and Fenland through the development of a strong, confident and ambitious arts community. Community groups, cultural leaders and artists will form Market Place Traders groups in each town to develop ambitious programmes across the voluntary, professional and commercial sectors.

See more at: http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/funding/apply-funding/funding-programmes/creative-people-and-places-fund/successful-applicants/#sthash.WcgMxh6Q.dpuf

STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, CHALLENGES, SUSTAINABILITY

'Creative People and places' was born as a challenge, starting from those regions and areas of the country that showed lower rates in arts participation. Starting from this point, and due to the huge and long-term perspective adopted by the project, it's too early to consider it a success. It's definitely a good example of participatory governance of cultural heritage resources stimulated by a regional authority in a top down mode, and involving players at different levels: municipalities, associations, civil society, other players in the region. Although a top down approach, due to the specific aim of activating local citizens and cultural organizations to imagine and produce their own artistic and cultural experiences, CPP can be interpreted as a "hybrid" approach. Considering the very different contexts (from suburbs to former industrial town, from countryside to colliery areas), and players, not only the format but also the outcomes are very different – even in this development phase - depending on how the local communities react to the grants and the subsequent projects.

The initiative is now in its third year, so it is possible to tentatively carry out an appraisal of its functioning and impact.

Talking about heritage, it's worth noticing that while the focus on participation is quite clear, and often involves citizens and communities in active participation and decision making, "institutional" heritage is not overtly or is very little present in most of the funded projects. Not only built and material heritage is seldom if ever at the core of these participatory processes, but also intangible heritage is less present within the submitted projects than the arts council had initially expected (see: *Observations from round one* at http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/funding/apply-funding/funding-programmes/creative-people-and-places-fund/observations-round-one/)

The top down national initiative was essentially to instigate these projects. The top down approach, although counting on a substantial budget, meant also that the process of activating communities was very challenging, and also for those who are now in the second year of activities it often took a long time to build trust and relationships among the communities. It will be interesting to follow them up to track their legacy and see if they can ultimately achieve the aim of increasing cultural participation (and therefore active citizenship) in those areas.

PUBLISHED INFO, WEBSITE

http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/funding/apply-funding/funding-programmes/creative-people-and-places-fund/

http://creativepeopleplaces.org.uk/

TITLE OF PROJECT	**TakeOver at the York Theatre Royal**
COUNTRY	United Kingdom
TYPE OF HERITAGE	Theatre
SIMON/WILCOX CLASSIFICATION	Hosted project-Supporting independent community interests/initiatives
ADMINISTRATIVE /INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL	Municipal

TakeOver is a three weeks festival planned and realised by young volunteers under the age of 26 in York. It has evolved out of 'A Night Less Ordinary', an Arts Council-funded programme to develop theatre audiences aged 26 and under.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

TakeOver was designed to provide a platform for young people to work together in a professional environment and realise their own potential. Its creative focus was on an annual three week Festival programmed and managed by young people under the age of 26 and held in York.

INITIATOR

York Theatre Royal

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The festival was initially funded by Arts Council England 2009 to 2011 and from 2012 to 2013 has been funded by the Paul Hamlyn Foundation with in-kind costs provided by the York Theatre Royal.

STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

- York Theatre Royal
- Paul Hamlyn Foundation
- Young volunteers aged 12-26

TIMEFRAME

Started in 2009 and ongoing

There have been six TakeOver Festival programmes so far:

2009 - 18 September to 10 October

2010 - 25 October to 30 October, followed by 14 to 26 March 2011

2011 – 14 to 26 March

2012 – 21 May to 9 June

2013 – 18 to 24 March, 3 to 8 June (plus extra week in The Studio for The Mercy Seat) and 14 to 19 October (the Residency)

2014 - 10th to 15th of November

DESCRIPTION (actions, methods, products, outcomes, major achievements)

TakeOver is an annual theatre festival run entirely by under 26 year olds who plan, program and deliver a theatre festival at York Theatre Royal, whose aim is to be 'a festival organised by young people for the whole community to enjoy and take part in'. The Project was undertaken after the very positive feedback from young people participating in 'A Night Less Ordinary', an Arts Council-funded national programme to develop theatre audiences aged 26 and under.

After the experience of 'A Night Less Ordinary', which was a programme with a national scope, the York Theatre Royal decided to bring the experimentation one step further to foster a richer engagement for young people.

TakeOver is managed by a Board of voluntary Trustees who take all of the important decisions. The Board is made up of around 15-20 young people aged between 12 and 26 years and with varying degrees of experience of the theatre industry.

Each year the recruitment of young volunteers into TakeOver follows a formal and structured approach following the usual recruitment policy and process adopted by York Theatre Royal.

Whether applying for a role on the Senior Management Team or for a place on the Board, this involves accessing an application form (usually online), submitting an application and attending an interview. This also goes hand in hand with a high level of professionalism about the programme and also demands a serious level of commitment from applicants to the application task, indicating the level of commitment needed for the programme itself, which is high. Participants who will "take over" the management must commit to attending regular fortnightly meetings, throughout the duration of TakeOver, from the planning stage right through to the festival and evaluation.

First contact with potential applicants comes via word of mouth, targeted communication, via their tutors or as part of TakeOver workshops, which are run by the theatre months before the Festival takes place.

While preparing the festival, the support from York Theatre Royal staff is always present, but not invasive: youngsters only ask if they need, but since then they are fully responsible of their choices, and are encouraged to be bolder about trying new things, even though they know that they risk not succeeding.

An induction programme and mentor for individual Senior Management Team members has been part of the support package provided by the theatre for TakeOver participants since its inception in 2009. For Board members this has also included an introduction to theatre staff and the mentorship of a trustee from York Theatre Royal's Board. Since the funding provided by Esmee Fairbairn Foundation and Paul Hamlyn Foundation to support a new role at York Theatre Royal for TakeOver, Creative Skills Promoter (previously Creative Engagement Officer), this has provided direct support to the Board and a focal point of liaison between the theatre and TakeOver programme as a whole.

STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, CHALLENGES, SUSTAINABILITY

In 2013 *&Co Cultural Marketing* was appointed by York Theatre Royal to support the evaluation of its TakeOver programme. Considerations hereby are largely based on this work, conducted by Alison Edbury.

TakeOver is a very successful project, and for undergraduates and post-graduates alike the practical and organisational experience of working as part of a professional theatre and making work for an audience generated a significant boost to their formative careers. Those who had carried out the roles of Artistic or Associate Director referenced the value of learning about the artistic and creative process of making theatre in a real life industry environment. This created a meaningful experience based on a deeper understanding and the fact that they could usefully transfer these skills into other future scenarios.

TakeOver is recognised as a unique and valuable opportunity for 12-to-26 year olds to develop their skills within a professional organisation that forms a supportive environment where learning and knowledge can be acquired by actually doing things with others, rather than simply being taught.

The evaluation report identifies that in the main, TakeOver participants have a connection with theatre, yet this connection before TakeOver has been limited, both from a personal and a professional point of view.

The support provided by York Theatre Royal mentors and general working relationships with staff has been praised by participants. Yet, over time this input is difficult to maintain consistently due to the very dynamic of the different people involved and the pattern of the programme. The ability of the Theatre to be flexible accordingly means that there is structure and support for participants but they have the right level of freedom and autonomy over their territory, at first a balance not easy to achieve.

The participation opportunities provided by TakeOver have been both meaningful and impactful encompassing a broad scope of choice for people to actively engage as both artist and social citizen.

Having three weeks of activity to programme that attracts different audience groups in significant enough quantities to the Theatre, has been the basis for a grounding and eye-opening experience for all, from which a huge amount of confidence and knowledge has developed. There is a wealth of experience acquired collectively over the five-year-programme by the Board and Theatre staff.

There has been an empowering effect felt by all participants in TakeOver but for the younger ones, it is particularly relevant since they have recently matured from being children to becoming young adults who are keen to participate in life and to know how it works.

There is a positive and transformational 'after' effect with TakeOver. This was clearly evidenced by all workshop participants, reflecting a range of life-changing opportunities and mind-changing aspirations that have been realised since participating in the programme.

Whilst it has been rooted in the professional environment of York Theatre Royal, the beneficial impact of TakeOver extends beyond the building into the wider community and different creative industries.

The TakeOver Board has been a pragmatic way of establishing a governance structure for the programme whilst also enabling under-18-year-olds to have as much opportunity to participate meaningfully in TakeOver as the over-18s. The TakeOver Board is a valuable decision-making forum for 12-to-26 year olds whilst also fulfilling a meaningful engagement opportunity.

The collective bond of working together – across different age groups – is part of the supportive environment that TakeOver provides. The mentoring relationship between theatre staff and Senior Management Team members is seen to replicate itself as mentoring relationship between older and younger participants and a deep peer-group respect is formed within the group.

The partnership governance model has been beneficial in that it supports the collaborative ethos of TakeOver enabling the teamwork effort to be realised in a way that is democratic rather than hierarchical. However, this model will need to change and become more structured as the programme seeks to widen its partnership by working with other groups and organisations.

TakeOver belongs to those projects whose main aims are both to build participation/to foster engagement with the arts, and to empower a specific strategic target giving young people the opportunity to gain skills and competences to help them developing their own professional and citizenship's paths (also outside the arts domain).

PUBLISHED INFO, WEBSITE

Most of information about the project and all evaluation comes from the unpublished "Evaluative analysis of TakeOver", prepared by Alison Edbury &Co in 2014 on behalf of The York Theatre Royal.

TakeOver Festival 2014 edition: http://www.takeoverfestival.co.uk/
York Theatre Royal: http://www.yorktheatreroyal.co.uk/page/Take_Over_Festival.php

TITLE OF PROJECT	*Our Museum* Supported Volunteer project/ *Making History* HLF St Fagan's Open Air Museum Re-development Project
COUNTRY	United Kingdom
TYPE OF HERITAGE	Museum built heritage, social history, intangible heritage, storytelling
SIMON/WILCOX	Hosted
ADMINISTRATIVE /INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL	National/Regional/Municipal

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

To really open up this museum (created at the height of Welsh Nationalism in the 1960s to preserve a sense of a separate national identity) and turn it inside out – trying to bring to the fore for community collaboration the museum's decision-making and knowledge production the new Welsh identity. To focus on skills and creativity, the 'hearts and minds' of the diversity of today's Welsh people, from right across Welsh contemporary society. And through a wide range of volunteering across the museums activities, to bring into the public sphere all that goes on in the background of museums (for example, collaborating in restoring the heritage buildings).

INITIATOR(s)

The redevelopment of the iconic St Fagan's (largest open air museum in Europe) and its central role in Welsh identity provided an opportunity to ask if the museum was any longer representative of the many changes in Welsh society since the museum first opened. The question asked was, 'does the museum have meaning for all Welsh people or only some?' Two key museum staff member committed to community partnerships opened exploratory discussions (no fixed plans at the outset) to consult with a very large group (almost 120) social, health and community-based organisations from local, national and regional agencies (including for example, substance abuse, refugees, homeless, unemployed) to consider what part National Museum Wales, and St Fagan's HLF redevelopment project *Making History* in particular, could offer their communities. The groups took a year to conduct their own research of the very large (multi-site) museum service and the possibilities it offered, helping the museum understand what types of work there might be available for people to get involved in from right across the entire museum service, and how three new galleries on the changing face of Welsh identity could be co-curated on the St Fagan's site.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Paul Hamlyn Foundation & Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF). The funding was shared with the partner organisations as service level agreements.

STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

Consortium of 14 Social, Health and Community organisations

TIMEFRAME

Volunteer programme already up and running (St Fagan's reopens in 2017/ plans for volunteer programme to be ongoing and extend across other museum sites

DESCRIPTION (actions, methods, products, outcomes and summary of major achievements)

Fourteen of the organisations self-selected to set-up a partnership with St. Fagan's Museum, co-designing and helping write the successful bid for funding (to the Paul Hamlyn Foundation) and training museum staff in preparation for the start of the volunteer programme, including writing and developing different volunteer roles. (Volunteers are drawn from across the 14 partner organisations). The organisations remain closely involved in recruitment, planning and supervision on an ongoing basis. 9 participatory forums from the partnerships continue to meet to influence content/ design of the galleries

STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, SUSTAINABILITY

The strength of the programme is that the museum now has a much larger volunteer force. The volunteer demographic has been dramatically changed, as has the active role of volunteers. There has been a high degree of co-curation in the 3 main galleries on Welsh identity. The partner organisations helped change museum staff through intense training to break down barriers across all activities, from exhibitions to volunteering. It has been noted that the links in human experience made between staff and wide range of volunteers is remarkable, crossing social barriers that would not otherwise have occurred. It also brought the different agencies and sectors into closer working relations. It has had a transformative effect on volunteers involved (See Paul's Story https://www.museumwales.ac.uk/4359/)

The Paul Hamlyn Foundation funding has now run out but the museum is committed to continuing and expanding the programme; it is presently collaborating on funding with the partner organisations, examining new models such as 'time exchange/'timebank' and new funding streams. There is a high degree of 'ownership' in the work by the partner organisations, because they helped write the funding bid and getting to know each other and the museum. Their ongoing influence has made the museum understand the need to invest in skilled volunteer management. There is a collective commitment to the programme's continuation. In terms of weaknesses, so far the volunteer programme has been localized to St Fagan's *Making History* redevelopment project and the ongoing operation of St Fagan's after it re-opens in 2017. Rolling this collaboration/volunteer programme out to the other sites belonging to National Museum Wales is the intention, but requires even more cultural change, particularly at middle management level (top level management is fully committed). This will take more effort from the museum and its partners.

PUBLISHED INFO, WEBSITE

<https://www.museumwales.ac.uk/4359/>

5 Special categories

5.1 UNESCO World Heritage sites

The 'Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage' was adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in 1972. Its primary goal was to catalogue, name and conserve sites of outstanding cultural (and later of natural) importance to the common heritage of humanity. Over the years, however, a number of policy and conceptual developments in the evolution of the World Heritage Convention determined the adoption of new approaches that resulted in putting conservation and engagement of local communities for the stewardship of World Heritage sites on an equal footing.

In 1992 the Cultural Landscapes category was included within the framework of the Convention, creating new opportunities to inscribe sites that embody the interactions between humans and nature and contain diverse tangible and intangible values. In 1995, the revision of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* specified the participation of local people in the nomination process. In particular, Article 5(a) of the World Heritage Convention now requests States Parties to adopt a general policy that aims to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community and to integrate protection of the heritage into comprehensive planning programmes.

The inclusion in 2007 of 'communities' as one of the five Strategic Objectives in the World Heritage Convention reflected an increasing demand for community engagement at all stages of the World Heritage process, and for rights-based approaches that link conservation and sustainable development.

In 2012, the year in which the World Heritage Convention celebrated its 40th anniversary, the debate on heritage and society was given an even stronger impulse and this set the agenda for the following years to recognize the crucial role played by indigenous people and local communities in the conservation of World Heritage sites and to develop more collaborative and community governance practices of the protected areas[6].

The management plans, which are now mandatory for World Heritage sites, usually involve a variety of institutional subjects and stakeholders and can offer interesting examples of multilevel and multi-stakeholder collaboration. While the conventional view of protected areas was that of places created and managed by governments, it is now becoming widely understood that they can also be collaboratively managed, or created and managed by communities and individuals in diverse arrangements.

---

[6] On participatory approaches in the UNESCO World Heritage Sites context, see Christopher Young 's *Managing Cultural World Heritage*, http://whc.unesco.org/en/managing-cultural-world-heritage/

The current people-centred conservation approach has produced meaningful experiences in community engagement.

As of May 2015, 1007 sites are listed in the World Heritage List: 779 cultural, 197 natural, and 31 mixed properties, in 161 States Parties. This offers all OMC Group Members an opportunity to look into the World Heritage Site closer to them, to see how governance is exerted and how local communities are actually involved.

5.1.1   Modena Cathedral, Torre Civica and Piazza Grande

The Modena Cathedral, Torre Civica and Piazza Grande were declared UNESCO World Heritage in 1997 as "*one of the best examples of an architectural complex where religious and civic values are combined in a medieval Christian town*". Since 2004, when it became compulsory, the City of Modena has adopted a management plan and a governance structure which sees the collaboration of different actors operating on a national, provincial and local level: the diocesan curia of Modena (the ecclesiastic body which deals with church assets throughout the territory), Modena City Council (which acts as UNESCO Site Coordination Office) and the Offices of the Ministry for Cultural Assets and Activities (Regional Directorate and Superintendencies) are all responsible for the protection and conservation of the buildings in question, while the Provincial Council of Modena collaborates on the valorisation of the site.

In parallel and in compliance with the 2012 evolution of the World Heritage Convention, which called for a stronger involvement of local communities, some programmes were launched to increase awareness of the importance of the prestigious Unesco recognition, strengthening the sense of co-responsibility among citizens. Various educational activities were set up together with a participatory project addressed to all inhabitants *"E' la mia vita in Piazza Grande" (It is my life in Piazza Grande)* aimed to collect stories, visual and audio materials to documents the history of the square over the years and in the perception of Modena's citizens.

www.unesco.modena.it

http://vitainpiazzagrande.comune.modena.it

5.1.2   Hadrian's Wall

To realise the full social, economic, learning and cultural heritage potential of Hadrian's Wall, the frontier of the Roman Empire and UNESCO World Heritage Site, in past years the Hadrian's Wall Interpretation Framework (HWIF) has been developed and implemented. The framework is an effort at developing a collaborative partnership between all partners along Hadrian's Wall. Its reception has been good and the HWIF is currently being used as a source of inspiration for other heritage sites and cultural routes across Europe.

At the heart of the HWIF is a limited set of shared narratives that guide the interpretation of Hadrian's Wall and associated sites. This creates a more unified and consistent experience for visitors across the heritage site, while at the same time allowing for diversity between partners. The HWIF has been developed in close collaboration with many partners and stakeholders along Hadrian's Wall in order to ensure maximum usability of the framework.

5.2   European Cultural Routes

The Council of Europe cultural routes programme began in 1987 with the Declaration of Santiago de Compostela launching the Ways of Saint James as the first Council of Europe Cultural Route. Its objective was to demonstrate how the cultural resources of the different countries and cultures of Europe contribute to a shared cultural heritage. Cultural Routes give practical application to the Council of Europe's values: human rights, cultural democracy, cultural diversity and identity, dialogue, mutual exchange and enrichment and at the same time provide potential for socio-economic development, enabling exchanges of people, practices and knowledge. "By European cultural route one understands a trajectory covering one or more countries or regions, organised around topics whose historical, artistic or social interest proves to be European, either because of the geographical layout of the route, or due to its contents and significance." In other words, a Cultural Route as recognised by the Council of Europe primarily constitutes a larger European theme, which enables us to better understand the history and memory of Europe.

Today there are 29 certified cultural routes crossing 70 countries. A Cultural Route's primary aim is to set in action joint initiatives where academics, heritage mediators, teachers and students as well as elected representatives, agents of regional development projects, politicians and a number of other stakeholders, work together to develop a research and conservation project, as well as a valorisation plan and an integrated touristic offer focused on a specific area.

A Cultural Route therefore creates an interaction between an area or a monument in need of protection and development, and the cultural and regional context to which it must be linked for it to be fully appreciated.

Cultural Routes offer significant potential for collaboration at all levels – European, national, regional and local – in order to promote sustainable and quality tourism in Europe. In particular, they encourage widespread community participation in cultural activities raising awareness of a common cultural heritage.

They are a model for grass-roots cultural co-operation, providing important lessons about identity and citizenship through a participative experience of culture. Developing common strategies and establishing strong partnerships with different stakeholders, local authorities and residents, who are often the owners of the cultural goods, is indispensable.

5.2.1   The Via Regia

VIA REGIA is the name of the oldest and longest road link between the East and the West of Europe. The route exists since more than 2.000 years and connects 8 European countries through a length of 4.500 km. Its modern form is the European Development Corridor III at present. An international network uses the potential of the VIA REGIA as symbol for European unification and was awarded as "Major Cultural Route of the Council of Europe" in 2005. Since then, the European Centre for Culture and Information in Thuringia (EKT) acts as European contact point for the project VIA REGIA. Trainees, researchers and volunteers complement the

team. Donations, own resources, personal contribution and project grants finance the EKT. It does not act profit-oriented and is unsubsidized.

The network that is built around the VIA REGIA is a voluntary association of corporate bodies under private and public law, person groups without a legal status as well as individuals. The network admits to humanistic and democratic traditions and a widespread cooperation in Europe based on equality, mutual understanding and tolerance between the people.

www.via-regia.org

5.2.2   Measuring limits of acceptable change (LAC)

It seems useful to recall here a tool which has been used within the context of European Cultural Routes, but might be employed also elsewhere, when an area is designated of natural or cultural importance, thereby introducing changes that will affect residents.

The Limits of Acceptable Change framework (LAC) is a visitor management and planning framework that aims to decide how much visitor-induced change in an area is acceptable. The LAC process recognises that change will occur in areas with visitor use and focuses on deciding how much change is appropriate and acceptable and how it should be managed.

The public (residents, local communities) is included in the evaluative components of the LAC-based decision making process to identify values, issues and concerns linked to a certain area. Through the involvement of stakeholders in ascribing values to a site, different perspectives can be taken into account and conflicts can be avoided or minimised at a later stage.

The value issue is indeed very important here: activities of valorisation of cultural heritage can be successfully undertaken if the resources are perceived as cultural heritage by the local community which owns them.

5.3   European Capitals of Culture

The European Capital of Culture (ECoC) programme is a EU initiative that has developed over the last three decades, after its original launch in 1985. By the end of 2019 the title will have been awarded to close to 60 cities in over 30 countries across Europe, including both EU and a selection of non-EU countries.

One key aspiration of the ECoC programme is the creation of new and sustainable opportunities for a wide range of citizens to attend or participate in cultural activities, in particular young people, volunteers and the marginalised and disadvantaged, including minorities. The success of an ECOC in fact can be measured by the active participation of its citizens, not only as audiences, but as protagonists already at the preparatory phase.

Like the UNESCO World Heritage Sites and the European Cultural Routes, the European Capitals of Culture can offer the OMC Group interesting examples of public engagement programmes and participatory initiatives.

5.3.1 Matera European Capital of Culture 2019

Background

In 2007 the regional government of Basilicata started a pioneering project called 'Visioni Urbane' (Urban Visions) whose aim was to use digital engagement to involve young professionals in the creative sector in identifying regional policies for culture and creativity. That experience had a double effect of revealing local unrest within creative professionals, and of creating a community of people for the very first time collaboratively engaged in shaping public policies related to them.

In 2009 a group of citizens from Matera, who had nothing to do with the community born within the 'Visioni Urbane' project, decided to start an association and to promote Matera as future European Capital of Culture that, in 2019, will involve Italy. It seemed a dream and few believed in it at first, but slowly the idea started to spread and after two years, in 2011, local authorities finally decided to take up the baton and start the 'Comitato Matera 2019'. The committee gathered regional and local authorities, University and others, and of course the association which first promoted the candidacy. This process was significantly supported by the previous experience of the regional government with Visioni Urbane, whose community will be later an important asset for the participatory process initiated and endorsed by the Matera Committee.

The Manifesto

In 2012 the Committee published a Manifesto. This moment represents a milestone, because it makes evident to citizens and to the rest of the world, the role of participation in the process of building the application bid.

It's worth quoting it, also because it represents a clear reference to the evolution of the same concept of heritage within the UNESCO interpretation.

We are Matera

A city is not only made of streets, buildings and urban infrastructure – not even if it has been granted UNESCO World Heritage status. A city is all these things, plus the knowledge and the skills – embedded in its local community – enabling the maintenance, adaptation, development and improvement of such physical artefacts. Such knowledge is more fundamental than the physical infrastructure: given the knowledge, a city destroyed by a cataclysm can be rebuilt, preserving its identity even though the stone and the steel are no longer the same. But once the knowledge has withered, time will reduce buildings to rubble, fill the canals, cover the roads with jungle and forest, and scatter the population. A city – any city – is software.

Therefore, the Sassi are not Matera. We are.

The time has come to update Matera's software, and that means stepping forth in full awareness of being citizens of Europe and Planet Earth. We need to look beyond the Gravina, over to Europe, the Mediterranean and the planet with new eyes. Learn as much as we can; share our best; to rethink ourselves, with no reservations or prejudices, but also without losing sight of who we are. If we are Matera, it is we that need to walk this path; it is we that must regenerate in completing it. Matera's bid as European Capital of Culture 2019 is an opportunity

to do just that. It is a challenge the city has never faced before. It obliges us to answer interesting (sometimes uncomfortable) questions about our role, both in Italy and in Europe. It forces us to be innovative, and get rid of a lot of accumulated ballast.

Hence, Materani from all over the world and friends of Matera, join us on this online community. We will help the Scientific committee of Matera 2019 to prepare the application bid, but most of all we will rethink the city and accompany her through yet another phase of her 10,000-years long story as a human settlement.

Community Matera and the Web Team

People were set at the core of culture, and culture at the core of a possible future.

In September 2012 CommunityMatera was launched, a web site totally devoted to collect and discuss proposals by local associations and citizens. The community was born with the aim of supporting the scientific committee working on the bid, and to stimulate bottom up proposals which had to meet only one condition: those who promoted activities also had to run them. No (or possibly very little) financial support was given, and over 2 years and half, more than 250 activities were run all over Basilicata (one the main feature of the bidding was the involvement of the whole region, that has two main cities and many small towns and villages) by the community. More the 50 associations deeply worked on it, producing from smaller to bigger events involving the wide community around the bidding.

Some impressive ideas were born this way (in October 2014 Matera hosted the biggest Coderdojo ever realized worldwide, with 1.000 kids), and other were proposed by traditional cultural institutions. Within those, the National Gallery of Matera (National Museum of Medieval and Modern Art of Basilicata) promoted some outreach innovative project. In 2014 the Gallery brought some 17th century paintings in a working class neighbourhood, where some locals hosted them in their living room, while researchers and restorers spent all day with them and their friends, relatives and neighbours discussing about the artworks.

Towards 2019

Of course it is still too early to know what will happen in Matera, after this long preparatory activity. A foundation was established also before the winning, to give a legacy to the Committee that made all this possible. No matter what the future will be like, Matera represents today one of the most interesting cases of participatory governance of cultural heritage, moving from citizens, supported by public administration and opened to the community.

http://www.matera-basilicata2019.it/en/
http://community.matera-basilicata2019.it/en/node/122
http://www.coderdojomatera.it/

5.3.2 Participatory budget in Lisbon European Capital of Culture

Lisbon has been the first European Capital to adopt a participatory budget scheme, inspired by the values of participatory democracy and broadly rewarded. The first participatory budget was

initiated in 2008, with a wide scheme that allowed a real engagement of citizens, reserving 5% of the overall annual municipal budget to popular initiatives that were first submitted and then voted by people.

To promote the initiative amongst the inhabitants, the Lisbon municipality produced at first a number of small round-table events in which interested parties could meet with a representative of the town hall and discuss their ideas, before presenting them for the public vote. Over the years this process has evolved, firstly moving from a totally online submission process to a mixed online and paper submission process. After a number of years, projects are now gathered and promoted following more focused areas (like culture, environment, public spaces and green, sport, etc.). Culture is not the only field of course, but is the focus of many of the submitted projects. In 2012 at MUDE (Design and Fashion Museum), a gigantic wall was made with more than 55,000 Post It stickers where the people of Lisbon were invited to share ideas and proposals to transform the city. This initiative of the Municipality of Lisbon was called "Ideas for Lisbon" and aimed to encourage active citizenship and be reflected in the participatory budget.

In the 2014-2015 edition, 47 projects classified as "cultural" were presented and voted by Lisbon inhabitants.

http://www.crickcentre.org/blog/participatory-budgets-portugal-new-route-public-engagement/#sthash.XqwpaO5T.dpuf

http://www.lisboaparticipa.pt/pages/orcamentoparticipativo.php/A=711___collection=cml_article

5.4 EU funded projects

This is another area for the OMC Group to monitor, as some recently funded and current European projects feature research activities on and collection of case studies regarding audience development, citizens' participation and participatory practices.

5.4.1 ADESTE

ADESTE (Audience DEveloper: Skills and Training in Europe), is a Leonardo Da Vinci project - Development of Innovation, co-financed by the European Commission. Pooling the resources and expertise of 9 partner organisations in 7 countries, the project's aim is to develop and train the "audience developer", a new European occupational profile in the fields of arts and culture. ADESTE recognises the key role of cultural organizations and institutions in developing new kinds of relationships with citizens and fostering participation, and tries to meet the need of the new competences required to cultural operators to tackle the challenge. The project started in November 2012 and will end in March 2016 with a public conference in Bilbao.

The project can be resumed in 4 main sets of activities:

- The first phase (2013) was devoted to mapping audience development training paths across Europe and to gather information about the required competences and market needs. It was

carried out through desk research, dozens of interviews and both national and international focus groups with professionals in the field.

- The second phase (2014) was about defining the core professional profile in terms of skills and competences.
- In the third phase (2014-2015) an innovative training format to be tested was developed by the consortium.
- The last phase, started in April 2015, is testing the pilot training in Denmark, Italy, Spain and UK.

In a participatory governance perspective, although Audience Development does not necessarily and always imply the idea of including people in decision making, the consortium worked a lot on framing the concept of audience development as key topic for opening culture to the wider community. Starting from the cultural sector perspective, stimulating participation means to support cultural professionals in developing skills and attitudes in order to support heritage in finding its role within citizens and communities.

In this perspective, ADESTE is an interesting project encompassing the challenge of building up the professional and organizational conditions to make a "participatory approach" for cultural institutions possible.

http://www.adesteproject.eu/

5.4.2   NEARCH – New scenarios for a community involved archaeology

The project understands archaeology as a community-oriented and socially committed human science, rather than a restricted academic domain. Among other issues, it explores the different dimensions of public participation as well as the significance of archaeological heritage intertwined with different processes underway in today's Europe.

With regard to participation in particular, NEARCH looks at:

- public engagement in the construction and appropriation of archaeological knowledge with the objective of
- transforming scientific academic data into public outreach materials, thus enabling the general public to be actively involved instead of merely being a spectator;
- the role of the community in archaeology and heritage to improve active dialogue with the civil society and create a participative archaeology, open to the different kinds of social engagement present today;
- the social and public dimension of archaeology, re-thinking the role of amateur archaeology and aiming to improve the dialogue and the collaborations between amateurs and professionals archaeologists.

NEARCH is funded by the EU programme Culture (2013-2018).

http://www.nearch.eu

5.4.3 Creative Museum

The Creative Museum Project seeks to explore and inform the connections between cultural organisations and their communities by capitalising on the emergence of new and democratising digital technologies. Seeking to extend the language of engagement through the medium of accessible, customisable, and personal digital experiences, the project sees museums as dynamic learning environments in which staff and visitors can use accessible digital tools to explore and reason about collections in new and creative ways. The Creative Museum Project is funded by Erasmus+ VET Vocational education and Training (2014-2017).

www.creative-museum.eu

5.4.4 BeSpectACTive!

BeSpectACTive! is a European project based on the active involvement of spectators in the contemporary performing arts. Its partners are European festivals, theatres, universities and a research centre.

The key word of the project is active spectatorship, referring to the mechanisms through which audiences, namely spectators or citizens, take on the role of decision makers with regard to many of the aspects needed to carry out a festival or a theatre or dance programme. The project aims to give to the audience a decision-making role, providing them with individual responsibilities in a common space of creation. In every city of the network an identified local group of spectators works all year long, with the aim of selecting part of the programming of the theatre/festival.

BeSpectACTive! will produce 12 new theatre and dance shows that will come to life through a relationship with the audience also through artists' residencies and open their rehearsals.

A research will be conducted to investigate the impact of the participative methodologies used in the project. It will analyze how the active spectatorship modifies and affects the way in which professionals work during their artistic creation and influences the programming of the artistic organizations. At the same time it will look at how an active role of the audience can enhance its capacities to understand the artistic process, improving its relationship with the artistic groups. .

BeSpectACTive! is funded by the EU Creative Europe Programme (2015-2018)

http://www.bespectactive.eu

6   Final Considerations

In a large museum in London a few years ago, a Chinese community member brought the museum's neighbourhood consultation meeting to a standstill by simply asking of the museum professionals present, "What is it the museum wants to do to me? What is it that needs changing or improving?" "What - or who - is it for?"

In other words, she was questioning how the museum's public engagement and participation practices were deemed 'useful', and for whom? And on what foundational assumptions this work continues to be based?

Fundamentally, this woman's question asked what *theory of change* lies at the heart of the museum's participation agenda?[7]

Reflecting upon the interestingly wide range of approaches to participatory governance included in this report (displaying the variations of the Arnstein; Wilcox and Simon spectra of participatory practice), one is reminded once again of this woman's good question? What is the point of the public's participation?

This has become one of the key questions in the debates about participation and the evaluation of participatory practice and it defines key trends and questions that concern those engaged in developing participatory practice. These are:
- Participation – rhetoric or reality?
- Participation – or empowerment-lite?
- Participation as Active Agency: Cultural heritage as resource for capability development and self-determination?
- Organisational Change or participation as an optional extra?

6.1   Participation – rhetoric or reality?
Development Studies, where so much of the literature on participation can be found, has focused on assessing the realities behind the increasingly widespread – and often self-congratulatory – rhetoric of participation.[8]

---

[7] A theory of change does the following, it
- Defines all the building blocks required to bring about a given long-term goal. This set of connected building blocks is interchangeably referred to as outcomes, results, accomplishments, or preconditions.
- Describes the types of interventions (a single project or a comprehensive community initiative) that bring about the outcomes. Each outcome is tied to an intervention. See Centre for Theory of Change online: *www.theoryofchange.org/what-is-theory-of-change/*

[8] See for example:
  Gaventa, J. 2006. Triumph, deficit or contestation? Deepening the 'deepening democracy' debate Brighton: Institute of Development Studies Working Paper 264.
  Cornwall, A. 2008. Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation? Exploring New Approaches to Participation in Development, New York: Zed Books.

Cornwall in particular has recently focused on terminology and what are referred to as buzzwords[9] such as "participation" and "empowerment" that have gained considerable purchase in recent years in local and international development and right across the public sphere, permeating as we have found the language of the cultural heritage sector.

This new consensus is captured in a seductive mix of buzzwords words that are persuasive and positive sounding, promising an entirely different way of doing things. Yet, the terms we use are never neutral. They come to be given meaning as they are put to use in public policies that vary a great deal, as we have seen in sections 4 and 5 above. And these policies, in turn, influence how those who work in the cultural heritage sector come to think about what they are doing.

If we look right back at the history, participation has long associations with social movements, and with the struggle for citizenship rights and voice. Yet, as Cornwall and Brock note, "…words that once spoke of politics and power have come to be reconfigured in the service of today's one-size-fits-all recipes, spun into an a-politicized form that everyone can agree with."[10] Participation has been used for centuries as a means to enable ordinary people to gain political agency and engage in shaping the decisions that affect their lives, but also as a powerful means of avoiding change. As Cornwall puts it, such 'buzzword' terminology carries "the allure of optimism and purpose, as well as properties that endow them with considerable normative power."[11]

Yet, the fantasy of participation continues to grow ever more powerful, offering the invitation and inclusion of everyone, everywhere. The Internet presents this dream as reality, supposedly erasing borders and distinctions, smoothing out differences and hierarchies –. We are all equal now, because we believe everyone's voice can be heard.

Within the overwhelming mainstreaming of these notions of participation, how to untangle 'participation' from talk about involving users as consumers, or people being 'empowered' through the marketization of services that were once their basic right? How to reconnect 'participation' with struggles for equality, rights and social justice?

6.2   Participation or empowerment-lite?
 The questions that needs to be asked are, 'what difference has this shift to participation made in peoples' lives? And has it led to any meaningful change in the policies pursued by

Cornwall, A., and V.S.P. Coelho, 2007 Democratising Engagement: What the UK can learn from International Experience . London: Demos. www.demos.co.uk/publications/democratisingengagement Spaces for change? The politics of citizen participation in new democratic arenas. ed. A. Cornwall and V.S.P. Coelho,2007 1-29. London: Zed Books.

[9] Cornwall A. and K.Brock, 2005 Beyond Buzzwords "Poverty Reduction", "Participation" and "Empowerment" in Development Policy, Overarching Concerns Programme Paper Number 10 Nov. 2005, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

[10] Ibid, page 5.

[11] Ibid Page 9.

mainstream cultural heritage practice? Or do such offers of participation simply involve, as some might charge, the appropriation of nice-sounding words to dress up a 'business as usual' practice, and through an illusion of participation, offer little other than 'empowerment-lite'?

This has led to a significant trend amongst both professionals and public to be generally dissatisfied with the obvious gaps between the realities of participatory practice and its presentation for example in staff training, publicity documents, organisational plans and in grant applications. The fact that both public and professionals are challenging current norms and looking for significant departures from them is a significant new trend.

How to find out if participation is working for people? Ask them!

While the present research collects many examples of participatory practices showing different levels of engagement and empowerment of the people involved, genuine and in depth assessment of how this participation worked and was perceived both by the cultural heritage institutions and by the public is scarce, although some projects which are just now starting intend to do so in the future (see 5.4.4 BeSpectACTive!).

Therefore, the outcomes of a study which principally focused on evaluation and was conducted across the museum sector in the UK sheds further interesting light on the subject. Despite the fact that it refers strictly to museums, having been conducted as participatory action research, and including in-depth interviews with a wide range of individuals and institutions over a number of years, it is useful here as indicative of the results one might reasonably expect if other studies of this nature were carried out in the cultural heritage sector at large.

Over the past five years, this action research was conducted throughout the UK on behalf of government foundations, funding agencies and arts/heritage institutions in close cooperation with museums and their community partners, and collaboratively examining the effectiveness of public engagement and participation in museums, from the point of view of both those on the delivery and the receiving end. [12] It made it clear that continued attempts at participation have not effectively challenged institutional habits of mind. By continuing to place people in the position of *beneficiaries*, cultural heritage exercises invisible power, and can thereby rob people of their active agency and the necessary possibility of resistance.[13]

Indeed, research into the impact of participatory policies and practices has further demonstrated that the museum remains firmly in the centre, displaying a relationship with participants of 'teacher and pupil', 'carer and cared-for'. The rhetoric of service, in whatever guise, continues to place the subject in the role of 'supplicant', 'beneficiary' or 'learner' and the provider (the

---

[12] The research projects are examined and are available online in a series of articles by Dr Lynch. See: https://ucl.academia.edu/BernadetteLynch

[13] Lynch B. 2011 *Whose Cake is it Anyway?: A collaborative investigation into engagement and participation in twelve museums and galleries in the UK,* London: The Paul Hamlyn Foundation.

museum and its staff) in the role of 'teacher/carer', perpetrating a **'**deficit' model of which assumes that people, 'learners' have 'gaps' which need filling or fixing through museum intervention, rather than a theory of change that places people at the centre, as active agents in their own right.

Meanwhile, the museum institution's fear and avoidance of 'clash' underlies an expressed aim to deliver 'social cohesion', resulting in the museum's overemphasis on 'consensuality' and denial of the opportunity for difference, debate, conflict and resistance to be made manifest, reinforcing what John Gaventa calls 'false consensus'.[14]

Not surprisingly the museums' community partners and participants frequently convey frustration and dissatisfaction, finding themselves on the receiving end of museum practices that demonstrate a profoundly disabling view of the individual as existing in an almost permanent state of vulnerability. There has been very little let-up on museum control.[15]

The most important outcome has been an overarching understanding and commitment to the importance of dialogue, debate and reflection *with all stakeholders* as an embedded and ongoing element of participation, without which it is essentially meaningless.

6.3   Participation as Active Agency: Cultural heritage as resource for capability development and self-determination?

The challenge here is to not only question if participation really does bring about a transformation in the cultural heritage organisation – however that is defined - but, to borrow from Nobel prizewinning welfare economist, Amartya Sen, to ask, in what way does participation increase people's 'capabilities', and furthermore, help build strong communities.

Sen defines a capability as 'the power to do something' and examines how ideas of justice relate to ideas of power, capability and democracy. A 'good society', in his view, is one populated by individuals with the capability to choose and construct good lives, with each citizen having a broad enough set of 'capabilities' to be responsible for their own well-being.

If 'capability failure' of any kind is a matter of concern, those related to people's inability to act freely or speak openly because of the power of others have special urgency.[16]

This emerging trend is to look at participation within this context of capability development; this trend means that participation is less focused on what people can do for institutions but rather what people can do for themselves through using institutional resources - a major, conscious

---

[14] Gaventa, J. 2004. 'Towards Participatory Governance: Assessing the Transformative Possibilities', in S. Hickey and G. Mohan (eds),

[15] Lynch, B., 2011b Custom-made reflective practice: can museums realise their capabilities in helping others realise theirs? *Museum Management and Curatorship,* Volume 26, Issue 5, 2011 Special Issue: Taking stock: museum studies and museum practices in Canada.

[16] Sen,A.,2010 Annual DEMOS lecture. On line http://www.demos.co.uk/events/annual-lecture-2010-hd.

move away from an institution-centric view. Otherwise, as we have discovered, the result can be 'business as usual'.

The test becomes: is a programme really offering opportunities for dialogue, debate, sharing authority in terms of governance and building individual or collective capability, resilience, sustainability? A good beginning is illustrated in the example of participatory budgeting for culture in Lisbon [5.3.2 above].

Reading through the examples presented, it is not at all clear that these outcomes are always achieved, or whether they were part of the projects' initial ambitions.

Nina Simon (author of *The Participatory Museum*, 2010[17]) spoke recently about how a museum can make a difference socially, how it can become 'socially relevant'. Through a museum-wide strategy of what she calls 'radical collaboration', Simon cited 'social bridging' as central to her (Santa Cruz, California) museum's social role, with the clear-sighted goal of empowering people to create 'stronger communities'.

This more recent trend focuses on *capability*, of individuals, groups, and whole communities. It challenges the notion of 'participation' as doing *for* or even *with*, but rather focuses on communities doing for themselves, with the help of a range of resources that may hopefully include cultural heritage. This re-focusing on capability and self-determination is well expressed in the locally initiated and delivered Gualtieri Theatre project [Cantiere Aperto (Open Building site) section 4 above]in Italy and on a much larger scale, also in Italy, the stirring example of the city of Matera becoming Capital of Culture through local citizens' efforts [5.3.1 above]
 Worth quoting again from the opening lines of their Manifesto:

> *A city is not only made of streets, buildings and urban infrastructure – not even if it has been granted UNESCO World Heritage status. A city is all these things, plus the knowledge and the skills – embedded in its local community.*

How to support such admirable capability development is the question, without killing it through a heavy-handed, top down approach?

The new trend is on working in partnerships towards people themselves building strong communities. This is no longer about being consumers consulted regarding their views on a cultural commodity, it reflects instead the move from 'users and choosers to makers and shapers' [18] making change happen in their communities and becoming more capable in the process.

---

[17] Simon. N, 2010 The Participatory Museum, available free online http://www.partipatorymuseum.org/
[18] Cornwall A.J., and Gaventa, 2001. From users and choosers to makers and shapers: Repositioning participation in social policy. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies Working Paper 127.

The emphasis is on collective and individual capability development that always involves back and forth dialogue, debate and negotiation and sometimes working through conflict as part of the democratic process.

6.4 Organisational change or optional extra: Helping Cultural Heritage Organisations become effective active partners

A key trend in the identification, assessment and criticism of participatory practice is a focus on the ability -or willingness – of organisations to embed the real change needed to support genuine development of participatory practice. This is a change process that centrally requires the involvement of the public as a critical friend and key change agent.

Hence the need for an intense process of critical and transparent dialogue about the participation objectives of an organisation, of questioning, (in echo of the Chinese woman), 'who and what is it for?', 'who says so?' and 'why?' –

Is participatory practice aimed at community capability development or cultural heritage audience development? Is it about active spectatorship or is it about people becoming initiators of their own experience? And exactly how has it impacted issues of governance? Have organisations embraced the kind of changes that need to be made to genuinely engage with their publics, or are they pursing project specific funding that is peripheral to the organisations mainstream enterprises?

As has been shown, recent debates have questioned the effectiveness of participatory practice in museums, in particular, its failures to overcome institutional power.[19] Despite well-meaning intentions, participation is not always the democratic process it sets out to be; rather, it more frequently reflects the agendas of the institution where the processes, such as the final right to edit content, are tightly controlled by the institution itself.

Besides the rhetoric in policy documents, it is important to understand the actual intention and outcomes of participatory practices, as it was discovered through extensive research into the impact of decades of investment in public engagement and participation in UK museums. Again, reference is made to the research undertaken in UK museums, as it seems to be a field which has been thoroughly investigated in that country, and can yield interesting results, applicable also to different heritage contexts.

---

[19] (Peers, L., and Brown, A. eds. 2003 Museums and Source Communities, London, Routledge
Crooke, E., 2007.Museums and community: Ideas, issues and challenges, London Taylor & Francis
Lynch, B. T. and S. J. M. M. Alberti. 2010. Legacies of prejudice: racism, co-production and radical trust in the museum. *Museum Management and Curatorship* 25: 1. 13- 35.

These issues are directly addressed by The Our Museum: Communities and Museums as Active Partners programme[20]. This is an initiative, funded by the Paul Hamlyn Foundation, to facilitate a process of development and organisational change within museums and galleries committed to active partnership with their communities, with the ambition of affecting the museum sector more widely. Working with nine museums, this initiative is currently:

- Supporting and developing museums and galleries to place community needs, values, aspirations and active collaboration at the core of their work
- Involving communities and individuals in core decision-making processes and to implement the decisions taken
- Ensuring that museums and galleries play an effective role in developing community skills
- Developing reflective practice models with staff and the public
- Sharing exemplary new models with the broader museum sector.

The *Our Museum* evaluation criteria (derived from the *Whose Cake is it Anyway?* noted earlier), although developed for museums could be easily adapted to other cultural heritage contexts. They are listed below:

Outcome 1:   Rooted in local needs:
Has the Community led the identification of issues and requirements?

Outcome 2:   Community agency:
Is the community centrally involved in the development, implementation and review of programmes?

Outcome 3:   Capability building:
Have participants /local communities identified the capabilities they need; has the museum/cultural heritage organisation identified the capabilities it needs to meet these requirements?

Outcome 4:   Reflection
Is there continuous dialogue debate and review of the dynamics of the relationship between public and organisation, as the relationship develops? Has the relationship developed to enable more effective partnership?

Is it important perhaps to begin with identifying what *good* looks like for all stakeholders? And who is deciding from the outset? Thus addressing the Chinese woman's concerns noted at the beginning of this section.

National Museum Wales, a multi-site national museum service, for example [section 4 above] has made as its starting point the needs of the community organisations not the museum or heritage site.

---

[20] http://ourmuseum.ning.com/

In the major re-development of the St Fagan's Open air Museum [the largest open air museum in Europe] it has consulted with over 120 national and regional community based organisations and is now co-producing a radically changed volunteer programme based on community needs identified by the community organisations themselves.

It is not a community volunteer project aimed to recruit free labour, a 'make-work scheme'. It took a year for the community organisations to research the Museum services to see not only what fits the needs of their communities, but what changes needed to happen organisationally in the museum in order to make the museum useful to the needs of the partner organisations – and then to train museum staff and contribute to changing working policies and practices in order to make those adjustments possible.

This is a significant shift for a cultural heritage organisation to see its role as a resource for community use, and it has highlighted the need for it to be able to open up to this type of co-produced working.

6.5   Creating a framework for sustainability

The concept of participation in the management of cultural heritage resources highlights the role and contribution of the general public - and not just of experts - to the preservation, but also to the constructive use of heritage assets. As illustrated, the value different individuals or stakeholders attach to heritage resources is an essential driving force to determine their involvement in different activities related to cultural heritage protection, valorisation, management. On the other hand, public institutions have responsibility for creating the conditions for public engagement and facilitating self-directed grassroots activities, where they exist. Only in a few cases (like Memory of the East in section 4.), projects find their own way and live a life independent of the public organization which initiated them. In the majority of cases, heritage institutions not only have to fund or co-fund participatory activities, but, most important, must create the conditions for their sustainable development. Sustainability does not only mean availability of economic resources, but much more importantly, the creation of an appropriate framework in which participative initiatives can grow and be maintained in the long term, in which collaboration between different subjects and actors, public and private are established. The case of the 'Open Building Site' clearly indicates that the financial resources allocated by the Municipality which owns the theatre are a small percentage of what the young people's association can raise through sponsorships and their own work. Nevertheless, the public institution can mobilise other stakeholders and facilitate the contacts between the association and the external world, so it plays an important role.

Likewise, in the case of Archaeology Scotland (3.2.1), the public authority oversees a triangular collaboration between itself, the local community and the private owners. By requiring the

signing of a formal agreement, it establishes a successful management model where all parties are equally and formally committed to the long term sustainability of the project.

The challenge for public authorities is to encourage people's real energy, commitment and responsibility while all the while being conscious to avoid killing their cultural heritage initiatives with too much of a heavy-handed, top-down approach. The key is therefore to play less of a 'leading' role, and more of a supportive, facilitative role, to lend expertise to help people create mechanisms which assist their independent initiatives to pursue objectives of general interest related to cultural heritage (see 'Creative People and Places', 'Cities as Common Goods' and 'Young People for the Territory' in section 4). This role includes helping explore, negotiate and put in place budgets, as well as mutually agreed and appropriate regulatory frameworks and management models to help make the collaboration between citizens and institutions a permanent feature of public policies.

6.6   In conclusion…

We are witnessing a time when the great profusion of participation rhetoric has matured to allow us to step back and take a more analytical way of examining what the language and purpose of participation actually means, to ask for whom – and who decides?

The small attic room in the picture above is an upstairs meeting room above a publicly funded art gallery on a dark, wet and windy evening in the town of Skegness on the island of Orkney, off the most Northern tip of Scotland. This group of young people from the local town are

discussing participatory governance and what it means in terms of their relationship with the town's only gallery down below where they sit. After much discussion between themselves, they decided that the most important elements were the following:

- Reflect: the process of review and consultation
- Participate: the opportunity to initiate, be involved and take part
- Influence: the capacity to inform, challenge and change

In this way, this small group of young people remembered something far too easily forgotten in the language of participation – it is not enough to listen to people's views, but rather, it is very important to offer the possibility for people to actually *influence* change.

The present report gives very good examples of the importance of local initiatives and the power to influence change, sometimes in rather small places such as the theatre in Gualtieri, that create a ripple effect of capability development that has impact far beyond their locality. Similarly, for more than twenty five years Glasgow's Open Museum, based at Glasgow Museums Service's Collections Resource Centre, has seen itself as a resource for communities across the great city of Glasgow to use the city's collections. They see their role as that of facilitating wide ranging participation and *use*. Another excellent example is the Adopt a Monument Scheme (3.2.1) of Archaeology Scotland, which provides the means by which monuments and communities are brought together for the benefit of both, helping groups across Scotland to deliver sustainable conservation projects. , Within this trend, the cultural heritage organisation may be an initiator of such initiatives, (e.g. Netherlands, Geheugen van Oost section 4, above) but always consciously moving towards people's self-determination.

There is an overarching trend here, in which the linkage of participation and social justice, of citizen rights is overtly made within the move to democratise participation in cultural heritage. The question is how to support this trend so that participation and participatory governance actually means something emancipatory and empowering for communities, making all of us stronger.

7   Acknowledgments

8   References

Getting cultural heritage to work for Europe Report of the Horizon 2020 Expert Group on Cultural Heritage, 2015
http://bookshop.europa.eu/en/getting-cultural-heritage-to-work-for-europe-pbKI0115128/

European Institute of Cultural Routes, *Cultural Routes management: from theory to practice*, 2015

World Heritage, *Engaging local communities in Stewardship of World Heritage*, paper nr 40, November 2014, pp 118
http://whc.unesco.org/en/series/40

Study on European Cultural Routes impact on SMEs innovation, competitiveness, and clustering, 2010
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/routes/StudyCR_en.pdf

Nina Simon, *The Participatory Museum*, Santa Cruz, 2010
http://www.participatorymuseum.org/

Adopt a Monument Toolkit
http://www.archaeologyscotland.org.uk/sites/default/files/AaM%20Tool-Kit.pdf

Council of Europe, *Heritage and beyond*, 2009
https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/Identities/PatrimoineBD_en.pdf

Council of Europe, *Actions for a changing society*,
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/Identities/Faro-brochure_en.PDF

Clay Shirky, *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations*, New York: Penguin Group, 2008

Cristopher Young, *Managing Cultural World Heritage*, UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN, 2008, http://whc.unesco.org/en/managing-cultural-world-heritage/

Crooke, E., *Museums and community: Ideas, issues and challenges*, London Taylor & Francis, 2007

Don Tapscott and Anthony D. Williams, *Wikinomics: How Mass Collaboration Changes Everything,* New York: Penguin Group, 2006

Jenkins, Henry, Puroshotma, Ravi, Clinton, Katherine, Weigel, Margaret, & Robison, Alice J., 2005 *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century*, http://www.newmedialiteracies.org/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/NMLWhitePaper.pdf

Peers, L., and Brown, A. eds. *Museums and Source Communities*, London, Routledge, 2003

Cornwall A.J., and Gaventa, *From users and choosers to makers and shapers: Repositioning participation in social policy*, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies Working Paper 127, 2001

David Wilcox, *Guide to Effective Participation*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation,1994
http://partnerships.org.uk/guide/guide1.pdf

Sherry R. Arnstein, "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," JAIP, Vol. 35, No. 4, July 1969, pp. 216-224