

Monika Göttler/Matthias Ripp
For the OWHC Regional Secretariat
Northwest Europe and North America



O V P M
O W H C
O C P M

Community Involvement in Heritage Management Guidebook



in cooperation with
Joint Project European Union / Council of Europe COMUS and EUROCITIES

Funded
by the European Union
and the Council of Europe



Implemented
by the Council of Europe



Photo front page: © Fotolia.com



Organisation des villes du patrimoine mondial
Organization of World Heritage Cities
Organización de las Ciudades del Patrimonio Mundial
Organização das Cidades do Património Mundial
منظمة مدن التراث العالمي

STADT
REGENSBURG 

OWHC GUIDEBOOK

Community Involvement in Heritage Management

in cooperation with

Joint Project European Union / Council of Europe COMUS
and EUROCITIES

Monika Göttler/Matthias Ripp

For the OWHC Regional Secretariat
Northwest Europe and North America

Funded
by the European Union
and the Council of Europe



EUROPEAN UNION

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Implemented
by the Council of Europe



CONTENTS

PART I – Introduction	6
Foreword Regensburg – Mayor Gertrud Maltz-Schwarzfischer	6
Foreword OWHC – Secretary General Denis Ricard	7
Contributions by our cooperation partners - Council of Europe & EUROCITIES	8
Introduction to the guidebook	10
PART II – Theoretical Background	14
Community involvement in urban heritage <i>Nils Scheffler, urban expert</i>	14
A new tool in heritage management evaluation: Communication Model for Built Heritage Assets – COBA <i>Susanne Hauer/Matthias Ripp, City of Regensburg</i>	22
PART III – Practice Examples	30
<i>Promotion & valorisation of Urban Heritage</i>	
A) Intangible heritage	
I) Antwerp/Belgium: The Red Star Line Museum	30
II) Helsinki/Finland: Open Albums (Albumit auki)	32
B) Tangible heritage	
I) Amsterdam/Netherlands: Heritage Days	34
II) Bamberg/Germany: Visible World Heritage borders	36
III) Goris/Gyumri/Armenia: Urban Walks	38
IV) Warsaw/Poland: World Heritage Interpretation Centre	40
V) Berlin/Germany: Information station with café at Hufeisensiedlung	42
C) Targeting at entrepreneurs and young people	
I) Beemster & Amsterdam/Netherlands: Van Wereldformaat - collaboration with entrepreneurs	44
II) Philadelphia/USA: World Heritage Education Program	46
III) Quedlinburg/Germany: Lodge for young people – voluntary year in monument preservation	48

Supporting owners in safeguarding their Urban Heritage

- I) Porto/Portugal: The Bank of Materials 50
- II) Rauma/Finland: Living with cultural heritage 52

Use of Urban Heritage for community and cultural development

- I) Riga/Latvia: Ziemeļblāzma Culture Palace 54
- II) Dortmund/Germany: Unionviertel creative quarter 56

Participative development of actions, management plans, guidelines, policies for Urban Heritage

- I) Zhovka/Ukraine: Youth Activists School 58
- II) Québec/Canada: Table de concertation du Vieux-Québec 60
- III) Stralsund/Germany: World Heritage Advisory Board 62
- VI) Regensburg/Germany: Citizen’s dialogue forum 64

PART IV – Outlook..... 66

- Community involvement as a key strategy for heritage-based urban development
Matthias Ripp, City of Regensburg 66

PART V – Bibliography 71



PART I – Introduction

Foreword

**Gertrud Maltz-Schwarzfischer,
Mayor, City of Regensburg**



Regensburg was awarded UNESCO World Heritage status in 2006. Since then, Regensburg has been committed to an integrated heritage management strategy. During the application process and while developing our management plan it was a priority to involve all stakeholders as well as the local residents. In order to gain the support of the broad public – be it passive or active – it is of utmost importance to make use of community participation (CP).

Our experience so far with CP has been very positive, and several urban development projects are currently being accompanied by public dialogue forums. The city administration clearly benefits from the comments and ideas put forward. In addition, long term support for a project is guaranteed due to the diversity and scope of the groups involved.

As Mayor of Regensburg, I am delighted and honored that our city was chosen to host the OWHC Regional Secretariat for Northwest Europe and North America in 2011. International cooperation and networking amongst World Heritage Cities makes us stronger; to be sure, there is always something to be learned from our colleagues round the world. World Heritage is of universal significance and we work to implement related strategies in our local communities.

It is against this background that the OWHC Regional Secretariat has compiled this handbook for the professional heritage community. The examples of CP featured bear witness to how our partner cities are already sharing our own experience of integrative concepts in urban heritage management. The value of the handbook is further enhanced by the profound theoretical background it contains.

An archaeologist myself, I know exactly how important it is to cherish our cultural heritage while developing awareness of the past in order to create understanding of the present. Only then can we build a better future in line with the UNESCO vision.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "G. Maltz-Schwarzfischer". The signature is fluid and cursive, written on a white background.

Gertrud Maltz-Schwarzfischer
Mayor of Regensburg



Foreword

Denis Ricard, Secretary General of the Organization of World Heritage Cities

Involving local communities in the management, presentation and promotion of a city's cultural heritage is not always a simple and obvious process for municipalities. However, the 21st century has seen the rise of urban occupation by human populations and a proliferation of properties' inscriptions on the World Heritage List in urban areas now encompassing an unprecedented number of 1600 including parts of cities, townships and villages, if we include serial properties.

In 2017 it has become unthinkable not to take into account the views of local people in the mechanisms to be adopted to preserve and manage the UNESCO's property or properties present in the urban territory of a city.

This observation is due to the fact that this „UNESCO specificity“ provides an additional level of engagement to be respected in order to ensure the outstanding universal value which defines a part of the urban heritage. Consequently, seeing culture as an enabler for the local sustainable development of a city has an obvious and direct impact on the daily lives of the inhabitants of the concerned neighbourhoods.

The question then is what participatory roles can be given to the local communities to assist the municipalities in their obligations?

The OWHC is going to provide insight into this question through its 14th World Congress that will happen in 2017 in Gyeongju, South Korea.

But even before going to Gyeongju, the Regional Secretariat of North-West Europe and North America has already collected some examples of community involvements from its own members.

This initiative took a year and produced a guidebook dedicated to practices for local experts and elected members who wish to discover what “community involvement” is about. It presents a good overview of this vast theme and indeed is useful as a good preparation for our world congress.

We encourage our members to read it and we hope that the examples and conclusions contained in it will inspire the cities of the OWHC in all regions.

Congratulations to the Regional Secretariat on its initiative and its subsequent success.

Denis Ricard
Secretary General of the OWHC



O V P M
O W H C
O C P M

Council of Europe




In line with the organisation's political priorities, the Council of Europe has developed a distinctive approach in support of its 47 member States, considering cultural heritage as a part of human rights of democratic societies' development as well as of participatory governance models.

The Council of Europe's Technical Co-operation and Consultancy Programme has had a profound impact on European heritage policy and practice over the last forty years. A variety of methodologies, introduced over the course of this programme, has provided solid frameworks for action.

Numerous bilateral and regional projects have played a crucial role in improving organizational learning and demonstrated a capacity to respond flexibly and innovatively to changing socio-economic and political circumstances. In accordance with its core values, the Council of Europe has built its deserved reputation on its dedication and commitment to seeing heritage as a fundamental component of a free and democratic society. Through its conventions, including the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada, 1985), the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage [revised] (Valletta, 1992), the European Landscape Convention (Florence, 2000) and the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro, 2005), the Council of Europe has broadened the vision of heritage with an integrated approach, situating heritage at the heart of solutions to social questions.

The Council of Europe/European Union joint project "Community-led Urban Strategies in Historic Towns" – or COMUS as it is known – was launched in 2015, and drew on the experience gained from earlier projects developed under the Regional Programme on Cultural and Natural Heritage in South East Europe and the Kyiv Initiative Regional Programme, which aimed at developing a specific approach in the area of urban rehabilitation policy. Identifying and enhancing the heritage features of a town or district as a means of implementing an urban dynamic was based on the principle that heritage components, understood in their broadest sense, provide a system of resources that can be mobilised as part of a local development project.

In this regard, co-operation with the Organization of World Heritage Cities was a natural partnership, where the COMUS project brought stakeholders together to seek and offer solutions for local economic growth through their heritage resources, with particular focus on historic centres, in a sustainable and socially inclusive manner. Working with nine pilot towns in Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, the COMUS







project introduced a place-based and community centred approach, in order to encourage the continued democratic engagement of stakeholders. Activities carried out under the COMUS project focused on awareness-raising of local populations towards the protection, promotion and responsible management of heritage, accompanying institutions in order to obtain the necessary technical tools, skills and capabilities to advance their professional development.

Working with all layers, from community to local and national levels, the project stakeholders went through four phases; namely the inception, planning, project and consolidation phases. This process was systematically guided by the COMUS team, thanks to a good supportive environment created by the Council of Europe and the Organization of World Heritage Cities. While each organization has brought its own expertise to the process, a synergetic working relationship has allowed the project to adapt itself according to the changing needs and challenges faced, which has enriched the learning environment for all involved. The community-based nature of the COMUS project

acknowledges the importance of expert work, while exercising the culture of democratic participation in making crucial decisions, in order to improve the quality of life for all residents and to reinforce local capacities. The Faro Convention principles and action plan have been introduced to COMUS countries in order to encourage sustained action and co-operation beyond the project.

It is hoped that this joint action with the European Union, in partnership with the Organization of World Heritage Cities, will provide a sound methodology and inspire similar actions in the coming years.

*Claudia Luciani
Director of Democratic Governance
Council of Europe
Strasbourg*



EUROCITIES Culture for Cities and Regions - Co-creation for smart investments in culture



Founded in 1986, EUROCITIES is the political voice and the network of major cities in the EU. With over 130 cities in 35 countries, we cover the majority of Europe's capitals and second tier cities and together account for one quarter of the EU's population. EUROCITIES represents the interests of its members and engages in dialogue with the European institutions across a wide range of policy areas affecting cities, including culture. The EUROCITIES culture forum, which

gathers over 100 cities, works to promote the increased recognition of culture as a vital aspect of public policies, and to foster access to and participation in culture for all.

With a view to 2030, EUROCITIES has identified a number of challenges which will affect cities and their cultural strategies over the coming decades. These challenges apply to all cultural heritage activities and institutions at local level. All our activities aim to help cities and their institutions to overcome these challenges. Successful experiences are already being showcased in the Culture for Cities and Regions initiative, funded by the EU's Creative Europe programme and led by EUROCITIES and KEA European Affairs. Launched in January 2015, the focus is on the impacts of cultural investments at local level and its effects on the cultural, economic, social and urban regeneration as well as how they can be transferred to other local contexts. 'Cultural heritage as a driver of economic growth and social inclusion' is one of the three main dimensions covered by the initiative and includes sub-themes such as: access to cultural heritage; civic democratic participation; better governance; and urban regeneration.

Through the EUROCITIES culture forum and Culture for Cities and Regions, we have identified several findings related to the success factors for smart investments in culture. Cities in Europe are increasingly putting culture at the heart of their local development plans and have sound policies and strategies to invest in heritage and, more widely, in the cultural and creative sector. Cities are key players in cultural provision and in the promotion and valorisation of cultural heritage, as they provide the diverse, concentrated mix that's needed of creative minds, tailored services, infrastructure, audiences and cultural consumers. Local cultural heritage represents a vital aspect of urban life, and it is the cities' role to make sure that it remains attractive to diverse audiences. Cultural heritage is a powerful tool that contributes to building cities' identities and increasing their attractiveness, and, when well-managed, heritage sites can drive economic activities and become hubs for creativity, culture, community interaction and social integration.

Local cultural and heritage institutions are increasingly geared towards a participatory culture - including co-creation - in order to provide content that fits the audiences' needs and includes them in the management and protection of their heritage. New approaches intend to involve local communities in the protection and preservation of urban heritage, increasing their responsibilities and feeling of ownership. Community involvement can be a driver for change. Cities play an important role in encouraging cultural organisations and communities to collaborate, share resources, group together and explore innovative forms of partnerships. Experiences from cities reveal that it is not just important to ask locals for their ideas, but to shape programmes with them and involve them directly. Co-creation can be an important

part of this, as citizens today are demanding more direct participation. Cities' cultural administrations can facilitate this process by acting as brokers to make local cultural organisations and different audience groups meet and discuss how to work together.

There is no one-size-fits-all approach to culture-led development, but cities nevertheless have plenty to share and plenty to learn. Their experiences and ideas, successful and unsuccessful, can feed into others' cultural development strategies. It is therefore essential that cities have a place to share and exchange expertise and good practices, which

is why networks such as EUROCITIES, and specifically the Culture for Cities and Regions initiative, are so important. They provide a forum for exchange and debate, enabling cities to confront future cultural challenges together.

Cécile Houpert
EUROCITIES projects support officer culture
Brussels



CULTURE
for Cities and Regions

Horizon 2030 cities' cultural challenges
<http://www.eurocities.eu/>



Community involvement in Urban Heritage Sites: More relevant than ever



The topic of participation and involvement of the public in heritage management is a current one. In 2007, the World Heritage Committee enlarged the already adopted four points of a strategic objective for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention: Credibility, Conservation, Capacity Building and Communication were amended with the so-called “fifth C”- Communities. Since then, communities are given a new focus in all heritage work and especially all UNESCO World Heritage sites. To identify, recognize and value the local community as key actor in the process of a sustainable heritage management, to enforce constructive dialog methods between all stakeholders, and to encourage a mutual understanding and collaboration has become the challenge of a successful heritage management.

In November 2015, the Organization of World Heritage Cities

decided on occasion of its world congress in Arequipa/Peru to make “Heritage and Communities: Tools to engage local communities” the main theme for the next congress in November 2017 in Gyeongju/South Korea. The topic was chosen in a bottom-up decision: the regional meetings on site were asked to discuss and suggest a favorite topic, and the main auditorium of the General Assembly finally voted for the theme. In this case, the selected topic was indeed submitted through our Regional Secretariat!



Under this premise, the OWHC Regional Secretariat for Northwest Europe and North America organized its 2016 Regional Conference in Stralsund containing a profound thematic workshop on “Community Involvement”. Next to practice examples on the topic of how community is already involved in our OWHC member cities, the EURO CITIES network was invited to the conference to present best practices from their point of view and to open up the scope.

The Regional Secretariat Northwest Europe and North America intends to provide further benefit to members of the OWHC, but also all other urban heritage sites dealing with the constant struggle of a successful integration of the local community. This practice-oriented guidebook on „community involvement“ is supposed to extend the conference report of Stralsund for a wider audience from a scientific point of view, and give even more profound insight on the different perspectives of community work. The approach of the OWHC guidebook is to also integrate project examples from COMUS (“Community-led Urban Strategies in Historic Towns” – a Council of Europe/EU project with support from OWHC Regional Secretariat Northwest Europe and North America) as well as the EURO CITIES network and strengthen a fruitful cooperation with these two networks.

For profound information on the topic from a scientific perspective, an introduction will be given to the state-of-the-art of research as well as a detailed description of the COBA model (Communication Model for Built Heritage Assets). The idea of COBA is to support and stimulate a more professional heritage communication and a more efficient use of existing resources, based on a stronger identification of citizens with their heritage assets.



O V P M
O W H C
O C P M

The OWHC Regional Secretariat Northwest Europe and North America, based in Regensburg/ Germany, as the initiator and coordinating editor of this publication was responsible for the collection of examples, which were all selected and revised by an external expert. We would like to thank all our OWHC cities for their active participation and support. Special thanks go also to Cécile Houpert from EUROCITIES as well as all responsible partners from the COMUS project network.

We hope this guidebook to be a useful resource for all urban heritage site managers, responsible practitioners and researchers in heritage management and other networks.

Matthias Ripp

Monika Göttler

OWHC Regional Secretariat
Northwest Europe and North America



PART II – Theoretical Background

Community involvement in Urban Heritage

Nils Scheffler, Urban Expert,
scheffler@urbanexpert.net

As highlighted by OWHC, Council of Europe and EUROCITIES in the introduction, the involvement of communities has become an important approach in preservation, management and promotion of urban heritage. Thus, they call to provide opportunities of engagement and cooperation with and for local communities; having the understanding that urban heritage can act as enabler of sustainable development, providing direct and indirect benefits to the daily lives of the cities' inhabitants. The urban heritage assets can be a resource for the local development of the communities - to be mobilised for and by them. Such heritage, that is meaningful to society, will gain the support of the communities for its proper safeguarding and use.

Heritage in this way, engaging communities in decision-making, can also be a fundamental component of human rights of democratic societies' development, a driver for change, transformation and innovation, not only in the management and governance of the urban heritage and their institutions. Therefore, cultural and heritage institutions are geared towards a more participatory culture, introducing innovative approaches to the governance of heritage - including co-creation - to increase the ownership of heritage-led development processes among citizens.

Also in the sphere of world heritage, the necessity of community involvement is underlined.

The "Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention" (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2016: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>) states:

"States Parties to the Convention are encouraged to ensure the participation of a wide variety of stakeholders, including site managers, local and regional governments, local communities, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other interested parties and partners in the identification, nomination and protection of World Heritage properties" (p. 2).

In the annex 3, page 75 (Guidelines on the inscription of specific types of properties on the world heritage list) they call:

"Heritage is only relevant, when it is relevant for the people."

"The nominations should be prepared in collaboration with and the full approval of local communities."

In annex 4, page 81 (authenticity in relation to the world heritage convention) it says:

"It is important to underline a fundamental principle of UNESCO, to the effect that the cultural heritage of each is the cultural heritage of all. Responsibility for cultural heritage and the management of it belongs, in the first place, to the cultural community that has generated it, and subsequently to that which cares for it."

In the World Heritage Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Committee, 1995, WHC-95/CONF.203/16: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/19COM>) it is stated:

"Participation of local people in the nomination process is essential to make them feel a shared responsibility with the State Party in the maintenance of the site."

The Burra Charta (ICOMOS Australia 1999), Article 12 states:

"Conservation, interpretation and management of a place should provide for the participation of people for whom the place has special associations and meanings, or who have social, spiritual or other cultural responsibilities for the place."



Outlining community involvement in Urban Heritage

As community involvement in urban heritage becomes more and more relevant in preservation, management and promotion of heritage in the whole world, it is important to develop a common understanding, what community involvement in urban heritage is about and what it is aiming at: on the one hand to be able to communicate and to exchange on it, and on the other hand to be able to apply this approach as beneficial as possible for the safeguarding of the urban heritage and for the benefit of the local communities. Therefore some minor explanations are given to “define” what community involvement in urban heritage is about.

A *community* is a group of people that have something in common. Such communities can be distinguished in:

- *geographical communities*: people that live in the same area;
- *cultural communities*: people that have similar cultural, religious, ethnic backgrounds and characteristics;
- *social communities*: people that have similar interests, beliefs, attitudes and objectives.

Involving them means to engage, to include them as participants in participative, engaging, collaborative or cooperative actions.

The term *urban heritage* embraced features that belong to the culture of an urban society and of communities, such as traditions, rituals, festive events (intangible heritage) or urban ensembles and buildings (tangible heritage), that were created in the past and still have historical importance.

This leads to the following understanding of *community involvement in urban heritage*:

Community involvement in urban heritage is about involving, including and the common acting of people, institutions and organisations, that are *interested* in the urban heritage, *affected* by the urban heritage or *live within or close by* the urban heritage, in the preservation, management and promotion of the urban heritage and its beneficial use for the local communities.

The people that are “*interested*” belong to the so called “heritage community”. They feel positive about the urban heritage and can / want to act as supporters. Also people of the geographical and



cultural communities (residents, users, owners, tourists, expats, etc.) can be part of the “heritage community” if they positively identify with the urban heritage and want to act as supporters. These are to be identified, in particular as multipliers to reach their communities.

The people that are “*affected*” (positively or negatively) can be residents, whose daily life is connected to the urban heritage, it can be users (i.e. tourists, people that work, do business in the urban heritage), owners of the urban heritage and people for whom the urban heritage is part of their culture (i.e. a church in which they pray, places where they meet).

People that “*live within or close by*” the urban heritage are the residents irrespective if they feel attached or not to the urban heritage or are affected by it. Here it is about finding out about their relation to the urban heritage, what they think and know about it.

Areas of community involvement in heritage practice

Taking a look at practice, community involvement in urban heritage takes place all over the world. The involvement examples can be grouped in five main categories: Part III provides some good practice examples in Europe for these categories.

Theoretical Background

1. Definition and inscription of Urban Heritage

Communities get involved in the inscription process of urban heritage to regional, national or international lists. This with the intention to raise the awareness about the values and significance of the urban heritage (increasing pride, appreciation and willingness to become engaged), to access local knowledge about the heritage, its history and development, its current state and safeguarding needs and in case of the inscription to the World Heritage list discussing the outstanding universal value.



2. Development of Urban Heritage policies, guidelines, actions and management plans

Community involvement takes place in the development of urban heritage policies to ensure that the needs and interests of local communities are reflected and linked to the safeguarding, management and use of the urban heritage. This also with the intention to ensure the proper understanding and support of such policies and to raise the awareness about the values and significance of the urban heritage, its preservation needs and to make them proud and engaged in the safeguarding and careful use of it.

3. Promotion and valorisation of Urban Heritage

Here activities take place to emotionally attach local communities to the urban heritage, to raise their awareness and understanding of the values and importance, to gain their support and engagement for the preservation and careful use of the urban heritage and to transfer “knowledge” to the next generation.


4. Management and safeguarding of Urban Heritage

Here activities take place to engage communities in the management of heritage, in physical conservation, to incite proper rehabilitation and careful use of urban heritage, to raise the awareness about safeguarding regulations and procedures and including them in the monitoring, the detecting of risks, problems and opportunities of the urban heritage.

5. Using Urban Heritage for community and cultural development

Here activities take place to ensure a beneficial use of the urban heritage for local communities without compromising the integrity and vitality of the heritage.

Vision and objectives for community involvement in Urban Heritage



The general vision for community involvement in urban heritage is to ensure that local communities benefit from the safeguarding of the urban heritage and that they can connect socially, culturally or economically with “their” urban heritage. Such ‘connected communities’ show a stronger commitment and are more likely to take responsible actions for the proper use, maintenance and promotion of the urban heritage. This vision emphasises the interaction and connection between heritage and communities.

As there are many and different communities, there are manifold needs and interests, partly in conflict with each other and directly or indirectly affecting the urban heritage. These need to be coordinated and balanced for a sustainable and beneficial use of the urban heritage in line with its safeguarding requirements. This leads to following objectives and tasks that can be the baseline for community involvement.

1. Recognise, understand, coordinate and balance

One objective of community involvement in urban heritage can be to recognise and understand better the manifold local needs and interests, which are affecting directly or indirectly the urban heritage and the area it is situated. It is about to balance and coordinate these needs, both, among the stakeholders and to bring them in line with the safeguarding needs of the urban heritage. This should be done with the intention to reduce conflicts, reduce the pressure on the urban heritage and make the communities aware of the urban heritage needs and values and increase their willingness to become engaged. Such involvement has the potential to lead to dialogue, negotiation and the building of mutually acceptable proposals for the benefit of both, the urban heritage and the local communities.

2. Link, connect, communicate, empower


A further objective can be to utilise community involvement to link the needs and interests of the communities with the urban heritage by providing or even producing cultural, social and economical benefits through the urban heritage for the communities. The involvement is about to empower communities to draw benefits from the urban heritage in line with the safeguarding needs. This will build up and strengthen the connection between the urban heritage and the (contemporary life of) communities, making the urban heritage part of their life and making them aware what they would lose if their heritage gets lost. Thus, besides communicating benefits, opportunities and values of the urban heritage to the communities, it is about to empower them and to develop activities that bring long-lasting benefits to the communities, which at the same time will increase their willingness to campaign for and safeguard the urban heritage.

3. Strengthen abilities and capacities

To enable communities to contribute to the preservation, management and promotion of urban heritage and to act as friends in all its facets, their abilities and capacities have to be strengthened. This can be achieved by sharing information, defining joint objectives and actions, providing trainings how to get organised and plan and implement activities; by supporting the coordination of communities and the creation of “lobby groups” and in general by providing opportunities of engagement and having a voice in decision making processes.

Theoretical approaches of community involvement in heritage management

Ladder of participation for heritage management
© Piu Yu Chan



In many scientific documents Arnstein's ladder of participation is consulted to describe the degree of participants' power to influence. Chan (2016; p.14-17) transfers this model to the “Ladder of participation for heritage management” to provide

Theoretical Background

a framework for preservationists, stakeholders and governments to understand the meaning of participation in heritage management at different levels.

The first rung is labelled with *'education'* or *'promotion'* in which experts and government educate the public about the values and significance of the heritage. The intention of participatory programs in this rung is basically to raise public awareness in the preservation of cultural heritage.

Moving one rung up is *'protection / conservation'*. In this rung, the public acknowledges that their heritage, whether tangible or intangible, is safeguarded and preserved by government bureau or any credible agencies. Public participation is relatively passive, almost inactive, in these two rungs because the communication network is a one-way information flow, transmitting from government or experts to laypersons.



Moving up to the middle rungs of the ladder, the public enters the arena to exercise its influence in heritage management. Voices can be expressed and heard in *'informing'* and *'consultation'*. The public can even take on a more active role on in the *'advisory'* rung in which they may advise on neglected areas that require preservation and comment on preservation projects. But participa-

tory activities at this level can easily be just a form of tokenism if there is no suitable mechanism to facilitate multi-sectoral communication. The public has little influence on decisions, hence there is no follow-through to change the status-quo.

Towards the upper rungs, the public begins to accumulate power to influence. In *'collaboration'*, preservationists or the government co-manage heritage in a way that public input exercise influence on the management process for a heritage asset. The distribution of power over preservation management is pretty even in this rung.

In *'grassroots-led negotiation'* the public initiates preservation campaigns and urges input from the government or experts. At this stage, the public has major managerial power or influence in making decisions over heritage management.

In the rung *'self-management'* citizens have veto power over heritage management. They can demand the degree of power which guarantees participants can be able to negotiate conditions under which "outsiders", or experts, may undermine values they ascribe to their heritage.

People-centred approach to conservation

Various scientific documents about 'community involvement in heritage' concentrate on a people-centred approach to heritage management. This approach is applied in particular to heritage sites that are used by a particular community i.e. practicing their day-to-day cultural activities at the heritage site or simply living and working there. The involvement models have concentrated how such communities can be involved in the heritage management. Hereby, communities are to be involved on the one hand, to build long-term capacity and improve the ability of local communities to manage and influence the development of 'their' heritage site, and on the other hand, to distribute benefits to the local community.

Co-management (Reggers 2013; Office of Environment and Heritage NSW 2015) is a model of the people-centred approach. It is strongly applied in South Australia (but also in parts of North America, India, Nepal and South Africa) to work in partnership with native groups to cooperatively manage national parks (traditional lands of Aborigines), combining traditional knowledge with contemporary park management. The co-management recognises and respects the connection

between indigenous Australians, their cultural heritage and connection with place and country. The co-management takes place through the creation of either a co-management board or a co-management advisory committee (formal institutional structures to share rights and power between government and civil society) to improve cultural site protection, maintenance of traditional practices that may have otherwise been excluded, and improved management of parks (collaborative management arrangements).




Co-management agreements reflect specific natural and cultural aspects of the park and Aboriginal community, they also encompass four fundamental principles:

- continued cultural, spiritual and traditional use of the park by the relevant Aboriginal group
- continued enjoyment of the park by members of the public
- preservation and protection of Aboriginal sites, features, objects and structures of spiritual or cultural significance
- protection of natural resources, wildlife, vegetation and environmental features of the park.

In general co-management includes power sharing; co-management as institution building; co-management as trust and social capital; co-management as a process; co-management as social learning; co-management as problem solving; co-management as governance (Berkes 2007, p. 23).





The *Living Heritage* model (Poullos 2014; pp. 129-138) is also a strand of the people-centred approach by ICCROM. The living heritage approach aims at maintaining-sustaining the original function of a living heritage site and, where appropriate, also reviving it in case this has been broken. The living heritage approach prioritises the core community's connection over the other communities' associations with the site, acknowledging that heritage forms an integral part of the life of the specific community, in that it strengthens core-community's identity, pride, self-esteem, structure and well-being.

On this basis, the core community is given the primary role in the conservation process. The core community does not simply participate in the process but is actively empowered: it has the ability to set the agenda, take decisions and retain control over the entire process. Conservation professionals and the broader community are given a secondary role, that of providing an enabling framework of support, guidance and assistance to the core community. Furthermore, the core community seeks development potentials on the basis of its own

connection with heritage and in accordance with its own concerns, with the support of the conservation professionals and the broader community.

Thus, the 'Living Heritage' promotes a new approach to heritage conservation that differs from the 'conventional', material-based approach by placing the living dimension of heritage at the core of decision-making and considering continuity as the key theme. The key principles are:

- recognising communities as the true long-term custodians of their heritage sites;
- empowering communities in the conservation and managing process, and benefiting from their traditional (and established) values, management systems and maintenance practices;
- linking conservation to the sustainable development of the communities, by developing a process to manage change and by making heritage relevant to the needs of the contemporary communities.

Communication model for built heritage assets

To support a more professional heritage communication and a more efficient use of existing resources to stimulate the identification of citizens with the cultural heritage, the World Heritage Coordination of Regensburg has developed a “Communication Model for Built Heritage Assets” (COBA). The intention of the COBA model is to increase the identification of citizens with their built heritage asset in order to get their support in allocating more resources to and preserving cultural heritage. It shall also improve the visitor experiences and in doing so enhance the impacts and benefits from different learning situations. The COBA model is presented on [page 22](#).

At the first level, the identification process only touches the social identity. Over the course of the next stages the citizen will become more actively involved. Finally, at the expert level at stage five, the expert multiplier is enabled not only to communicate the heritage asset and its values, its characteristics and context but to make adequate decisions. Additionally, these stages should help to broaden the horizon of heritage practitioners and stimulate new ideas as well as unconventional ways of heritage communication.

The notion behind this model is to adapt heritage interpretation to the contemporary understanding of ‘communication’ and identification: From a linear understanding of communication, that is characterised by a one-way ‘message’ approach, in the third millennium - through the use of social media and diverse formats of interactive communication - a systemic understanding of ‘communication’ that is happening in multiple dimensions between many actors is replacing a more traditional one.

Potential benefits of community involvement in urban heritage

As mentioned in the introductions of OWHC, Council of Europe and EUROCITIES, benefits through community involvement in heritage management for sustainable development are to be expected. But there are also direct benefits for the heritage practice, for the city administration and the local communities (Wijesuriya, Court, 2015, p.4).

City administration can benefit from an increased respect and better understanding and appreciation of the urban heritage by the involved communities. Their engagement and support of the safeguarding

of the urban heritage will increase the recognition of the meaningful contribution that the urban heritage can play for them. This might even allow accessing additional resources for the urban heritage and harnessing the capacities of the involved communities in terms of man power, knowledge and financial resources. In addition the involvement can open up democratic processes, improve transparency of government and build trust and open conversation between the city government and the communities.

The communities can benefit by achieving economic, social and cultural opportunities (i.e. increased employment and business opportunities, spaces for leisure) and an increased emotional attachment to their urban heritage through a greater sense of ownership and socio-cultural affiliation, a stronger local identity and sense of home in a globalised world.

Linking communities and the heritage more closely, will benefit both, a better safeguarded heritage and more prosperous communities.



A new tool in heritage management evaluation:

Communication Model for Built Heritage Assets - COBA

*Susanne Hauer/Matthias Ripp
World Heritage Coordination, City of Regensburg*

The Communication Model of Built Heritage Assets (COBA) refers to several scientific theories in the realm of learning and cognition. The idea of the COBA model is to support and stimulate a more professional heritage communication and a more efficient use of existing resources. Thus, the identification of citizens with their Built Heritage Asset should be increased in order to get their support in allocating more resources to and preserving cultural heritage. It shall also improve the visitor experiences and in doing so enhance the impacts and benefits from different learning situations. At the first level, the identification process only touches the social identity. Over the course of the next stages the citizen will become more actively involved. Finally, at the expert level at stage five, the expert multiplier is enabled not only to communicate the heritage asset and its values, its characteristics and context but to make adequate decisions. Additionally, these stages should help to broaden the horizon of heritage practitioners and stimulate new ideas as well as unconventional ways of heritage communication.

1. Cultural Heritage and Communication

In the context of celebrations for the European architectural heritage Year in 1975 European Heritage Preservation reached a climax. This was also the beginning of more serious efforts to communicate Heritage Values to an audience beyond experts and decision makers. Principle 9 in the European Charter of the Architectural Heritage from 1975 states: "Integrated conservation cannot succeed without the cooperation of all [...] the public should be properly informed because citizens are entitled to participate in decisions affecting their environment [...]" (ICOMOS, 1975). From then onwards, the perception of the role of citizenship in heritage management and com-

munication changed. In the 21st century the focus shifted from the preservation of individual monuments through later ensembles reached another peak with the ratification of UNESCOs "Recommendation on historic urban landscape" (UNESCO 2011). Today, cultural heritage is more and more understood in a holistic way "as a social and political construct encompassing all those places, artefacts and cultural expressions inherited from the past which, because they are seen to reflect and validate our identity as nations, communities, families and even individuals, are worthy of some form of respect and protection." (Labadi and Logan 2015 p. xiii)

The result of this changed perception is that a larger variety of stakeholders are relevant: Previously being merely viewed as affected stakeholders, citizens in all their variety were now more frequently described as an important target group due to their impact on political and socio-economic decisions and developments. Moreover, the ways of communication have changed: the digitalization of knowledge and information simplifies the access to more elaborate information and democratizes the availability of specific subject-oriented knowledge (Borgmann, 2010). Furthermore, the various possibilities that derive from digital technologies pose a severe impact on the presentation of information and its perception. The COBA model not only takes innovative tools of communication into account, it also refers to the five strategic objectives of the World Heritage Convention, which UNESCO declared in the Budapest Declaration (2002), including the Fifth C from 2007. COBA supports especially two of the "C"s: Communication and Community and as a secondary benefit: Capacity Building. Implementing the COBA model helps to increase public awareness, involvement and support for World Heritage and empowers people to get involved. Thus the role of the individual and the community are strengthened and this is an effective instrument implementing the World Heritage Convention. (UNESCO 2002/2007)

In the specific field of cultural heritage the digital revolution and the democratization of knowledge and expertise led to an even more heterogeneous group of stakeholders, e.g. institutions, NGOs, public and private media as well as private citizens. For instance in Germany the process became apparent through the establishment of the international Master's degree World Heritage

Studies (BTU Cottbus, 2016) at the BTU Cottbus in 1999 and the introduction of the official UNESCO “World Heritage Day” in 2005. Europe is preparing at the moment for a second edition of the European Year of Cultural Heritage. A broad consultation process implemented by the European commission is accompanying the development of the program and specific activities that will take place around Europe in 2018 (Ripp & Rodwell, 2016). The implementation of the well-established WHS program has stimulated together with other initiatives the ongoing scientific interest in the subject. The interest of local communities is for example in Germany facilitated through events like the annual World Heritage Day or the European Heritage Days, which are highlighting the growing interest in cultural heritage. In Heritage-Networks like the Organization of World Heritage Cities, the topic of heritage communication and, connected to this, participation is gaining much interest (Ripp, Göttler, 2016). With this new popularity and enlarged understanding of cultural heritage, one of the remaining questions is: How can we design and implement efficient and effective heritage communication? How can we focus on the special needs of different target groups? In Regensburg, the discussion about this topic became more intense during the elaboration process of the World Heritage Visitor Centre in 2011 and has continued until it reached today’s state of art. To have a theory-based model in the framework of the Herman Project the COBA-Model “Communication of Built Heritage Assets” has been developed and tested, as it is described at the project’s website. (<http://www.herman-project.eu/>)

1.1 Current Situation

Based on our current literature and practical experience and recurring to communication activities that refer to a built cultural heritage, three trends can generally be described:

- a. The number of communication activities has increased and diversified. In almost every world heritage city the assets are documented and explained. This information concerning the asset is available and accessible. (Ripp/Göttler 2016; Graz 2013; Quedlinburg 2013)
- b. The number of professional and private actors has increased, especially following the growing stakeholder involvement activities that started in the early 70s. All in all, the number of involved actors has risen.

- c. Communication flows tend to refrain from being one-directional thus leaning towards a more dialogue-oriented and interactive structure. Heritage is now subject to a large variety of communication tasks carried out in a multitude of ways by many different methodologies.

Cultural heritage and its values are communicated through guided city tours, exhibitions, websites, leaflets, books, smartphone apps, websites, games, art lessons in school and many more activities and channels. Nevertheless, many of these actions are developed in a rather un-reflective manner. The decision regarding a strategy and which tools are to be used is often based on experience and assumptions as opposed to documented evidence. Reflection concerning the internal goings-on at the psychological and sociological level of the recipient is rather rare. Therefore, it influences the process of developing actions quite randomly. That is why the first and main objective of this paper is to explain how the COBA was developed and structured. Secondly, it will also be shown how it can facilitate the communication of Built Heritage Assets. In addition, the different stages of the model will be outlined.

1.2 Objectives and use for COBA (Communication Model of Built Heritage Assets)

The research questions for this article are: What model can we use to enhance heritage communication? How can this model integrate different asset points to stimulate learning? And how can we stimulate not only rational knowledge but also the identification with the asset on a more emotional level? In order to answer these questions and to professionalize Heritage Communication, we take a look at the sociological models and the term identity first. Identification with heritage is of utmost importance if we want citizens to value Heritage Assets in the first place or even gain and give more resources to cultural heritage. Without the identification of citizens with the cultural heritage these objectives are very hard to achieve. This poses the question: How can we achieve a higher level of identification?

2. Heritage and identity: a sociological approach

Sociological definition of “identity” – Krappmann and Mead

Tourists give the perfect example for the power of emotional bonding to a place, country or event to built heritage. Emotional relationships arise when we take something personal. So to facilitate the target group’s identification with the Built Heritage Asset it is essential to take the serial stages of the human identification process into account. The Communication Model of Built Heritage Assets (COBA) refers to several scientific theories in the realm of learning and cognition, but mainly to Sociologists Lothar Krappmann and George Herbert Mead. The COBA-Model takes into consideration that identification is something genuinely personal and is highly influenced by internal and external factors, such as the specific cultural and intellectual background, personal interest and circumstances of being confronted with the object of identification. It also integrates the “Sensory stimulation theory” by Philip Johnson-Laird (Johnson-Laird, 1983), which states that “really efficient learning occurs when the senses are inspired and [...] greater learning takes place when multi senses are stimulated”. Thus, multi-sensory learning is one of the most successful ways to address target groups of different ages (Forbes, 2003) and leads to better results (Hattie, 2011). In this context, the action-oriented and holistic educational approach seems to be particularly promising. Furthermore, the COBA model completes theoretical reflections with concrete, action-orientated proposals for the use of media or methods at the different stages of the communication process. As Johnson-Laird (1983) states: “the individual personality consists of many elements [...] specifically [...] the intellect, emotions, the body impulse (or desire), intuition and imagination”. It also refers to the fact that identity arises always with regard to a different “other”. To learn that this “other” and the person itself have a common heritage that they both value is the first step to build a community. So cultural heritage is not to be seen only as a field of individual identification, but also as a canvas where community involvement can be implemented (Buckland, 2013). Looking at the COBA model, identification with cultural heritage also means

the approval of certain values. This gives the communication of built heritage assets a second twist. As Jana Peterkova states: “Currently the Council of Europe doesn’t talk about a unified Europe, but about »the Europe of cultural co-operation«, what means to think about Europe with some common principles and values, but at the same time with many different identities on different levels.” (Peterkova, 2003). So the benefit of proper and targeted communication of built heritage is not only the identification with the assets. Beyond this point we build communities who share common values following the premise of mutual respect and acknowledgement.

2.1 The need of individualized strategies to acquire identification

When dealing with Cultural Heritage Assets one of the objectives clearly is the integration of all stakeholders, e.g. citizens, local and municipal authorities, decision-makers and other relevant groups. Stakeholder support is essential not only to protect and to develop cultural heritage but to raise awareness of the obligation to do so as well. The best way to ensure that the target groups really do care about the heritage is to promote their identification with the cultural heritage. Therefore, the COBA model is based on the concept of identity from Lothar Krappmann. He states that identity is communicated by interaction and it emerges anew in every communicative situation (Krappmann, 1993). According to the objective “start of a positive identification process” identity consists of a social identity and a personal identity. The social identity is defined by values and norms of the social environment and it refers to the public role a person inhabits. The personal identity, however, covers the individual self, the private self-perception as well as the definition of how a person perceives itself (Krappmann, 1993). The main objective in promoting identification is to implement the heritage asset not only in the realm of one’s social identity but also within one’s personal identity.

2.2 Balanced identity through personal involvement

Consequently, the challenge of dealing with the intrinsic inconsistency of both antagonistic identities (individuality/uniqueness – social expectations/adapted role) in a gradual adapting way to gain a balanced identity arises. The balanced identity concept is an open one. It changes with every new communicative experience. Thus, it is possible that a formerly society-defined part of the identity is replaced by a personal one because the recipient's attitude towards the relevant object has changed. Following this line of reasoning the communicative objective of the COBA model is the implementation of and identification with the Built Heritage Assets in both identity counterparts in order for them to form part of a person's balanced identity.

Similar to Krappmann, George Herbert Mead starts with the supposition that identity emerges from social interaction through communication. He states that identity consists of one impulsive I (I) and a reflective I (ME). The ME incorporates and reflects memories and experiences, that can be objectified by the I. Accordingly, there is always a subject and an object within the identity construct. In this context, it is important for the COBA model that only those experiences will be remembered within the ME, which are of relevance to the individual as a whole. Altogether, the communicative objective here is to create relevance for the individual with regard to the Built Heritage Assets (Mead, 1968).

Development	A. Attitude towards Heritage Asset	B. Social and Personal Identity	C. Progress of Proficiency	D. Role of Citizen	E. Level of Involvement	F. Communication	
						Method	Media Example
1. Definition	Identify	Social Identity	BASIC Name	Recipient	Auditive Visual	Presentations Interviews	Exhibitions Flyer Articles
2. Awareness	Being conscious of	Social Identity	BASIC Describe	Recipient	Auditive Visual	Presentations Interviews	Exhibitions Flyer Articles
3. Exploration	Being informed	Social Identity Personal Identity	ADVANCED Put into Context	Recipient Stakeholder	Auditive Visual Motoric Haptic	Discussions Interactive Use of Media	Multimedia (e.g. Visitor Centre)
4. Participate	Being able to act	Social Identity Personal Identity	ADVANCED Know Functional Context	Multiplier Recipient Stakeholder	Auditive Visual Motoric Haptic in social context (interact)	Reactive Instruments Events Workshops Competitions Interactive Use of Media	Audioguides Apps Film
5. Transference	Communicate	Balanced Identity	EXPERT Holistic	Multiplier Experts (internal and external) Stakeholder Lobbyist	Auditive Visual Motoric Haptic in social context (interact)	Networking at Expert Level Conference Presentations Workshops World Cafés	Audioguides Apps Film

Chart 1: The Communication Model for Built Heritage Assets (COBA).

3. Step by step: from knowledge to identification

The COBA model consists of five serial stages. Each of these stages is to be viewed as a step towards increased and intensified identification with the Built Asset. There is no strict distinction between the levels and the process from one level to the next cannot always be organized linearly. For the identification process at least five characteristic stages can be identified. These are defined by the following indicators: The attitude of the person who passes through the stages of being a recipient, stakeholder, multiplier, expert, lobbyist and who – within the model – is neutrally called “citizen” (A), the state of identification (B) and proficiency (C) and the level of involvement (D). Step (E) focuses on the communication efforts, which meet the needs of the citizens during a specific phase. Additionally, it addresses the methodologies that can be applied (F).



Chart II: Elements (A to F) of a citizen's identification process lead to targeted communication.

Concerning the target group, the overall system begins at the level of a simple recipient with very limited rational knowledge (1) and ends at the level of a highly informed and involved expert (5) (Chart III)

with regard to the chosen Cultural Heritage Asset. Besides being useful in encouraging persons with different backgrounds to get involved, COBA illustrates the acceptance of a certain Heritage Asset with regard to a specific target group. In the following, the different stages of COBA will be described in detail (Chart III).




Chart III: The attitude (1 to 5) of a citizen indicated the status of the identification process.

3.1 Definition of heritage assets (1)

At the first level, the citizen as a recipient has little knowledge about the Cultural Heritage Asset. So far he or she can only name and roughly define it. We use the term heritage asset here, as described earlier, in a holistic way. It can also be something intangible, an artefact, etc. The identification process only touches the social identity, e.g. the citizen in his or her role as a pupil or someone who is addressed at a cognitive level only. This state of involvement is widely spread among the target group in “first contact”-situations. In Regensburg, we addressed this target group with flyers or articles. To raise their curiosity, we mainly provide audio-visual related activities such as guided tours through the visitor centre or presentations at school.

3.2 Awareness of heritage assets (2)

At the second stage, the citizen becomes more active, the consciousness and the background information about the asset increase. The motivation to learn more is already there, passive knowledge turns into more active and descriptive skills. Although the basic role is unchanged, the citizen is capable to explain fundamental information about the assets and address citizens with less or no background knowledge. The media and methodologies applied here are similar to the ones adopted at the first stage but comparatively more elaborate. A typical example for this part of the identification process is a pupil who gives a simple lecture at school about the heritage asset. All the same, the character of the communication and the senses involved remain audio-visual.

3.3 From Knowing to Doing (3)

The next step results in the citizen claiming a more and more active role. Action-orientation becomes an important aspect of the involvement. The personal interest rises while information is not only received but actively looked for. This development is important as it illustrates that, at this point, the personal identity is involved as well thus enabling the citizen to view information in a certain context and develop educated opinions and points of view concerning the Heritage Asset. Step by step, the citizen transforms into a stakeholder. By now, the level of involvement and tools of communication have a likewise advanced character: Together, methods, media, and senses addressed form a holistic approach, which will be extended and diversified at the next two “expert levels” resulting in increased “action-orientation”. The partners of our World Heritage Days mainly offer activities belonging to that stage: people can explore medieval craftsmanship, learn the process of paper production, and measure the height of an old church. Particularly for younger citizens (future stakeholder) this approach is very valuable.

3.4 Action-orientation and self-commitment (4)

Here, the most important difference to level 3 is the transformation of citizens and stakeholders into multipliers. Due to their knowledge about the functional context, these persons are able to participate and be decisive about questions concerning the heritage asset. Assuming the citizen

has a lot of contact with the issues related to the Heritage Assets motivation to learn as well as experience and interest in it increases. Thus, the identification process is leaning towards a balanced identity. At this level, the advanced multiplier introduces a new dimension: The impact of group learning and the sustainability of shared learning experiences. This dimension strengthens the identification process at the personal level even if the social experience takes place in an official or rather formal environment. The fourth level e.g. is the role a working group member “Asset XY for Children” might inhabit.

3.5 Expertise and assimilation of asset (5)

The most elaborated level of COBA is the expert level at stage five. Having reached that, the expert multiplier is not only able to communicate the heritage asset and its values as well as its characteristics and context but also to make adequate decisions. By “being the asset”, the expert feels entitled to transfer knowledge to persons from another level. Thus, the multiplier is no longer a mere multiplier and stakeholder, but a decision-maker for the asset – in short: a lobbyist. The objective here is not to make all citizens experts with regard to every Built Heritage Asset. It is however, to raise curiosity and interest in all types of persons whose help and support we need for the development and preservation of built heritage.

COBA therefore systemizes the experiences collected during the city of Regensburg’s first ten years of being a heritage site. Communicating the idea of a global shared heritage led Regensburg to the implementation of a visitor centre (URBACT. 2010). This place was created to provide information at different levels depending on who is visiting and on the person’s previous knowledge. So COBA has already been applied since May 2010 without having been formulated as a concept (Hauer, 2015).

Summarizing the above, the COBA model’s structure allows both: The definition of the target group’s level at a certain time AND a recommendation as to which actions can be applied and what kinds of media and methods can be used in order to advance them to the next level. Furthermore, it helps to decide which level would be appropriate for a certain target group.

4. From theory to practice

The COBA model can be applied in different ways:

For the scoping of heritage communication processes, for the evaluation and the improvement of these. The easiest way to utilize it, is in combination with a specific heritage communication task. In this context, the model can help with the identification of the target group's current stage as well as help to choose the appropriate methodologies. It is especially helpful for the design and scoping of any communication process related to heritage in our modern holistic understanding, that is including intangible aspects, processes, etc. beside the built heritage. Moreover, in combination with media, it can enhance the knowledge and identification with the Heritage Asset. Therefore, given that the chosen methodologies are appropriate, the COBA model can be used to design, reflect and evaluate the process. In a wider framework, the model can provide guidance to an overall evaluation of the communication situation and the definition of specific communication tasks. This also includes hints as to which methodologies are the most reasonable to apply. Additionally, the COBA model can be drawn on to explore the demands and interests of specific target groups and develop communication strategies accordingly. This demand-driven approach is rarely used in heritage communication. However, many references exist, which prove that learning results can be improved given an enhanced intrinsic motivation (Heckhausen 2010). Ultimately, the COBA model can be involved e.g. in the process of setting up a Heritage Interpretation Plan for a cultural heritage site, museum, or a significant listed building. With the correct use of the different levels outlined above, the current situation and the target groups can be identified. Furthermore, it can help to make decisions with regard to the next logical steps and as to which methodologies need to be applied in order to reach them.

Examples in Regensburg are:

Civic participation process during the elaboration of the management plan (2010)

See also practice example on page 64

Principles of the COBA model were implemented throughout the dialogue phase. The participating representatives of the citizenship were to a high

percentage categorized at COBA level 3. After the process most of the participants ascended to level 5 (Mühlmann (ed) 2009).

Activities for families during World Heritage Days (2007-2017)

At World Heritage Days, which are celebrated once a year at the first weekend of June, the focus of communication are families, children and young adults. These target groups require a specific approach, which acknowledges their individual experience with built heritage: Workshops, Guided Tours and certain activity programs take that fact into account. One very successful activity every year is a workshop, in which the participating kids can build models e.g. of bridges from sweet wafers or corn sticks. COBA facilitates the use of a World Heritage site as a didactic tool. (Memminger, 2014)

Communicating the values of the old Stone Bridge (2014), the Porta Praetoria and the new synagogue (current)

Different from the Heritage Days this communication process is ongoing. In all three cases the objective is to keep citizenship informed about restoration processes or building processes, which last longer than a year. Here the COBA-Model helps to find out, which information about the particular built heritage is crucial and expected and supports the acceptance of the changes the process may cause. (Ripp, M., Eidenschink, U., & Milz, C., 2011)

5 Résumé

Generally, the idea behind the COBA-Model is to support and stimulate a more professional heritage communication as well as a more efficient use of existing resources. It shall also improve visitor experiences thus enhancing the impacts and benefits of different learning situations. By pinpointing the different levels of the identification process and linking them to the appropriate methodologies, the horizon of heritage practitioners can be broadened and new ideas along with unconventional ways of heritage communication stimulated. While applying the COBA-Model during a wide range of heritage activities in Regensburg, we found that some principles are important for a successful implementation:

1. A holistic understanding of the heritage at stake.

2. A comprehensive understanding of what communication today is, rather systemic and multi-directional than linear.
3. An interdisciplinary team with different scientific and work-related backgrounds.
4. A flexible mindset rather than a rigorous linear step-by step approach.
5. The willingness to fully put yourself in the position of the target groups to understand their needs, interests and motivation
6. A systemic view of heritage with readiness to combine different activities and cooperate with a wide range of different stakeholders.

Communicating heritage is a rather complex task with many parameters involved. The most important ones are the members of the community, for whom we want heritage to put to use to improve their quality of life. The COBA-Model can help to achieve this overall objective.



References

1. Brecht, Dr. Eberhard (2013) *Managementplan der Stadt Quedlinburg*.
2. Borgman, Christine L. (2010): *Scholarship in the Digital Age: Information, Infrastructure, and the Internet*. Cambridge, Massachusetts u.a.: The MIT Press.
3. Buckland, Michael (2013): *Cultural Heritage (Patrimony): An Introduction*. Zadar.
4. Forbes, S. (2003): *Holistic Education: An Analysis of its Ideas and Nature*. Brandon, VT: Foundation for Educational Renewal.
5. Hattie, John (2012): *Visible Teaching. Maximizing Impacts on Learning*. Abingdon: Routledge.
6. Heckhausen, Jutta, & Heckhausen Heinz (2010): *Motivation und Handeln*. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag: 366 pp.
7. Hauer, Susanne (2013) *Management von Welterbestätten in „Welterbe Limes und Tourismus“*, Egar Weinlich (ed.), p.82 ff
8. BTU Cottbus (2016): *Fakultät 6 Architektur, Bauingenieurwesen und Stadtplanung*: <http://www.b-tu.de/fakultaet6/>.
9. COMOS (1975): *European Charter for the Architectural Heritage*. Retrieved from: <http://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/170-european-charter-of-the-architectural-heritage>.
10. Johnson-Laird, Philip N. (1983): *Mental Models: Towards a Cognitive Science of Language, Inference, and Consciousness*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
11. Hauer (2015). *The World Heritage Visitors Center. Invitation to Identification*. ISG Magazine 3/2015.p.30/31.
12. Krappmann, Lothar (1993): *Soziologische Dimensionen der Identität*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta: 13.
13. Labadi, S. and W. S. Logan (2015). *Urban heritage, development and sustainability : international frame works, national and local governance*.
14. *Managementplan der Stadt Graz (2013) Stadt Graz, Stadtbau-direktion/Weltkulturerbe Koordination (Hg)*.
15. Mead, Herbert-George (1934): *Mind, Self, and Society*. In Charles W. Morris (Eds.). Chicago: (Deutsche Übersetzung: *Geist, Identität und Gesellschaft aus der Sicht des Sozialbehaviorismus*. Suhrkamp-Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 1968, ISBN 0-226-51668-7).
16. Mühlmann, R., (2009). 'Der Welterbe-Managementplan: Ein integriertes Handlungskonzept für Regensburg ' Jahresbericht 2009 der Welterbekoordination Regensburg, City of Regensburg.
17. Memminger Josef (2014). "Überall Geschichte!: Der Lernort Welterbe – Facetten der Regensburger Geschichtskultur: Matthias Ripp und Susanne Hauer: Zielgruppenspezifische Vermittlung des UNESCO-Weltkulturerbes an Kinder und Jugendliche; p.130.
18. Peterkova, Jana (2003): *European Cultural Identity : The Role of Cultural Heritage in the Process of Mutual Communication and Creation of Consciousness of Common Cultural Identity*, Prague, 2003
19. Ripp, M., Eidschink, U., & Milz, C. (2011). *Strategies, policies and tools for an integrated World Heritage management approach; experiences from the city of Regensburg*. Regensburg. *Facilities*, 29 (7/8), pp. 286-302.
20. Ripp, M., Rodwell D. (2016). 'The Governance of Urban Heritage', *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice*, 7:1, 81-108)
21. Ripp M., Göttler M (2016): *Conference Report OWHC Regional Conference in Stralsund*.
22. URBACT (2010). *Analytical case study. Visitor Centre World Heritage Regensburg*. Available from: https://www.regensburg.de/sixcms/media.php/280/Regensburg_case_study.pdf

PART III – Practice Examples

The Red Star Line Museum, Antwerp, Belgium

Objective

The Red Star Line Museum provides space to tell stories about migration and support intercommunity dialogue, giving a historic site a new function.

Target group

Citizens, newcomers, visitors, artists, municipal services

Description of project

Between 1873 and 1934 more than two million people from all over Europe travelled with the Red Star Line company from Antwerp to America. In 2004 Antwerp city council decided to turn the former buildings of the Red Star Line shipping company into a commemorative site. The city bought three of the company's former warehouses that had served as control station for third class passengers wishing to emigrate to the New World. A design team restored the ruined buildings to their condition between 1921 and 1934, opening the museum in September 2013 and giving the historic site a new function. Until recently, it was the only migration museum on the European mainland housed in the original departure halls.

Through a state-of-the-art interactive exhibition, the highly contemporary and participatory museum tells the universal story of migration based on the thoroughly documented stories of passengers who transited in the buildings. With the help of, and in a permanent dialogue with its diverse audiences, local and international experts the museum has been collecting and investigating personal migration stories from the perspective of those who experience(d) emigration, and (re)valorises them as important pieces of heritage. More than 1,400 family mini-collections linked to the migration of an ancestor have been collected since opening the museum.

A strong focus is placed on narrative scenography and personal stories. The museum has been involving inhabitants in particular with migrant backgrounds in a co-creation process for that since 2009. Today museum guides, who have migrant backgrounds, share their stories with visitors. The museum also collaborates with schools and adult educational programmes to collect migration stories. It uses a "Red Star Line Transit Bus", an old city maintenance bus transformed into a travelling storytelling device. On the outside, it invites people to find out more about the Red Star Line museum and share their own migration stories. The bus has travelled to schools, adult education centres, neighbourhood parties and markets. Meanwhile, in the interior salon of the museum hundreds of new and old residents of Antwerp were invited to explore the stories of European emigrants of the Red Star Line and share their own migration stories with the museum. A selection of these stories is now featured in the permanent exhibition.

The museum also provides space for artistic re-interpretations, introspection and dialogue. It has cooperated with contemporary artists, writers, photographers, cartoonists, and television documentary makers and the theatre to create autonomous cultural products inspired by the memory of the Red Star Line emigrants. Most of these were co-produced by the museum.

The overall investment of €18 million was covered by a public-private partnership between the city of Antwerp (60%), the Flemish government (25%) and a group of European and American private and corporate funders (15%). The operational budget for 2016 is €300,000 (excluding wages and costs for personnel). The structure is now profitable thanks to revenues from ticket sales, merchandising, guided tours and private evening openings.

Since its opening, the Red Star Line Museum has been governed by the municipality as one of Antwerp's city museums. It is part of the city's Department of Museums and Heritage, which is part of the city's administration for culture, sports, youth and education.

Results & impacts

Collecting and sharing personal stories is a very positive way to valorise citizens while fostering intercultural and intergenerational dialogue. By empowering the residents and working together with local organisations, strongly rooted in the communities, Antwerp has strengthened the citizens' feeling (with migrant backgrounds) of belonging to the city. With the museum Antwerp also remembers that heritage is not only about buildings, but also about the diversity of local, intangible cultures

Promotion & valorisation of Urban Heritage

A) Intangible heritage

Lessons learnt & recommendations

The methodology used for collecting stories, past and present, from individuals and the way they were used (from important exhibitions to local discussion groups) is transferable. Turning memories from the past to the personal level to common history requires trust, time and understanding. It is a strong method to elaborate information and understanding of growing number of minorities in the city. Interaction between citizens and cultural experts (artists, producers, managers, planners etc.) is essential for that. To keep the story told in focus, staff must constantly keep the permanent exhibition alive, plan the content of educational programmes for all ages (schools and adult education schools), use every channel of information and take care of the existing and new networks. Here locals have to be involved to co-create the content at all stages, from pre-opening to everyday activities. Working with different local communities has helped to shape the museum and its activities, and has had an impact on social inclusion and participation of the new immigrant city population in cultural activities

Further information in the web

<http://bit.ly/2m6REpj> and <http://bit.ly/2n6ethU>

Contact person

Karen Moeskops, Red Star Line Museum director, karen.moeskops@stad.antwerpen.be

© Red Star Line Museum
© Red Star Line Museum, Bart Huysmans en Michel Wuyts
© Red Star Line Museum, Noortje Palmers



Promotion & valorisation of Urban Heritage

A) Intangible heritage

Open Albums (Albumit auki), Helsinki/Kontula, Finland

Objective

The Open Albums project aims to preserve citizens' memories of their city, in particular related to urban heritage, by digitising photos of private archives; this with the intention to make citizens aware about their heritage and its significance.

Target group

Citizens, seniors, museums, archives, researchers, journalists

Description of project

The Albumit auki (Open Albums) project is an online digital photo gallery. It collects and digitises photos from private archives and family photo albums that illustrate the heritage and cannot be found in official historical documents. By digitising these photos and putting them online, they are saved for future generations and cultural content is produced.

Citizen involvement is at the root and heart of Open Albums: the project invites people to add their private photos to a national collection. It also enables people to select photos to be displayed at exhibitions and to work as curators. As a result, citizens themselves are driving the process, which makes Open Albums even more attractive and accessible, especially for senior citizens interested in developing their digital skills.

Initially, the sole subject was Helsinki as seen by amateur photographers between the late 19th century and today. By now, Open Albums has grown into a national photography archive, maintained by Lasipalatsi Media Centre Ltd. The collection is constantly augmented by adding photos collected in other Finnish cities. But the underlying idea remains unchanged: collect old photographs taken by ordinary citizens, which form part of the shared cultural heritage, and make them accessible to the world thanks to open data. NGOs, municipal cultural services and other organisations (museums, regional archives) contribute to the Open Albums project.

Initially, the Open Albums project was financed by the EU Urban II programme. At a later stage, Lasipalatsi Media Centre Ltd (Helsinki City Group) took over the maintenance of the project's servers. In 2014-2016, Finland's Ministry of Education and Culture granted financial support to three related projects (€40,000 each), which enabled the organisers to expand the Open Albums project. They organised best practice exchanges, developed the archiving systems, and added options like open APIs (application programme interfaces, a set of routines, protocols, and tools for building software applications).

Results & impacts

Open Albums offers a practical way to help civil society, art and culture professionals, as well as institutions to identify each other as valuable actors serving the common good. New methods and practices employed by Open Albums have bridged the gap between generations, and overcome digital and social exclusion. The online gallery has attracted online visitors from all over the world

By involving the public and NGOs interested in photography, video art, and culture, the project has created new collections with quite limited financial resources.

By valorising and promoting the urban heritage with that the project, it has helped to raise the awareness of preserving memories of past generations. Knowledge is transmitted to future generations and can be used for research purposes.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

Photos, and memories in general, are by definition a delicate and personal matter. It is therefore crucial to build an atmosphere of trust and openness with the people to make them feel ready to share their memories with the public.

By using digital tools and new forms of social networking and online accessibility, Open Albums has enabled unprecedented forms of engagement in culture.

Services specialised in collecting/digitising photos should be brought close to the people. They should be available near retirement homes, immigrant centres, libraries, cultural centres or in museums. Once the idea takes root in public opinion, people tend to show great interest in participating and sharing their memories (be they photos or oral histories).

People everywhere relate to photography one way or another, and urban residents are especially inclined to share their history saved in private archives. It is also usually easy to make decision makers or those who can provide financial support understand the importance of such a project (i.e. to preserve private photo collections, old photographs, and the related stories, together with metadata, for future generations).

Further information in the web

www.albumitauki.fi

www.lasipalatsi.fi

<http://lasipalatsi.finna.fi/?lng=en-gb>

Contact person

Jani Suonpera – Lasipalatsi Media Centre digital supervisor

jani.suonpera@lasipalatsi.fi

info@albumitauki.fi



from the online digital photo gallery

Promotion & valorisation of Urban Heritage

B) Tangible heritage

Heritage Days, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Objective

To open heritage buildings to the public, presented by volunteers of all ages, accompanied by cultural activities.

Target group

Citizens, in particular children, adults and families; owners; volunteers, city of Amsterdam, heritage organisations, housing associations, cultural organisations

Description of project

During Amsterdam Heritage Days – every second weekend of September – about 60 historical buildings and sites are opened for the public free of charge. During the weekend also the national World Heritage Weekend takes place. Besides opening the doors of the heritage buildings, at many locations on-site activities during day and night take place like guided tours, walk tours, boat tours, bike tours, lectures, exhibitions, workshops and performances.

Particular about the Heritage days is the involvement of volunteers of all ages, training them to be heritage ambassadors during these days. Thus, more than 300 volunteers make the Amsterdam Heritage Days possible by preparing the days and working as hosts and guides during the weekend. To be able to do so the volunteers receive extra training. To include young people as junior guides a special junior training programme is provided. The junior guides lead the audience to their favourite monuments.

Results & impacts

Amsterdam Heritage Days has become the biggest free cultural event in Amsterdam over the last 30 years with over 40.000 visitors during the weekend. Over 300 young and old volunteers participate and have become ambassadors for the rich history and (world) heritage that the city has to offer.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

If you want to add something new to the programme, you have to add it two or three times in a row to improve it and get the results you are aiming at. A good example of this is the managing of volunteers: investing time (and money) to know them and discover their weak and strong characteristics. Hiring a volunteer coordinator improved this part significantly.

Further information in the web

www.amsterdam.nl/openmonumentendag

Contact person

Monuments and Archaeology, Inez Weyermans, i.weyermans@amsterdam.nl



© Photos Barako

Amsterdam Heritage Days:
Volunteers show people around in canal houses



Juniorguide Amsterdam Heritage Days

Promotion & valorisation of Urban Heritage

B) Tangible heritage

Visible World Heritage borders, Bamberg, Germany

Objective

The spray activity "Visible World Heritage borders" aimed to actively engage locals, visitors and young people in World Heritage by making the borders of the site "Town of Bamberg" visible.

Target group

Activists, locals, students, visitors

Description of project

The World Heritage site "Town of Bamberg" comprises three historic districts spread across an area of 142 hectares. In order to raise awareness for the areal extent of the "Town of Bamberg", the German Heritage Day in September 2016 was used to mark the borders of the World Heritage site with (washable) chalk spray. The activity was open to interested citizens, activists, locals, students and visitors. An open call for participation was communicated through various public media and social network channels, as well as extended to universities and associations.

Once the call for participation was published, the marking points along the border of and within the World Heritage site were identified. In a second step, plastic stencils were produced.

In preparation of the activity, the World Heritage Office formed several teams. Each team was equipped with snacks, stencils, spray cans and maps that identified the exact location of the marking points along the border of and within the World Heritage site. Supervised by the World Heritage Office, the teams then explored the city and marked the World Heritage borders with washable chalk spray. The activity was photo documented and widely communicated afterwards.

Results & impacts

The spraying activity proved to be a great success. A wide range of citizens between 21 to 69 years was mobilized to participate. Each participant learned about the extent of the World Heritage site whilst having a memorable day. Furthermore, the spray marks generated a lot of interest among locals and visitors alike, facilitating discussions and talks about the World Heritage site.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

Sufficient participants and spray cans are necessary to implement the activity. Therefore, it is of great importance to carefully calculate how many people and how much paint is needed for the area that is to be covered. In order to avoid difficulties, it is also recommended to obtain written permission from the municipality to spray the streets.

Further information in the web

<https://www.stadt.bamberg.de/index.phtml?NavID=1829.6&La=1>

Contact person

World Heritage Office, City of Bamberg
Ms Patricia Alberth
Phone +49 (0) 951 / 87-1811

Email: info@welterbe.bamberg.de



O V P M
O W H C
O C P M

© Pictures: City of Bamberg



Promotion & valorisation of Urban Heritage

B) Tangible heritage

Urban Walks, Goris/ Gyumri, Armenia

Objective

The objective of the Urban Walks is to raise the awareness and extend the understanding of the local people about their heritage: from conventional monuments to alternative and intangible heritage and landscapes.

Target group

Local community members with a special focus on teenagers

Description of project

Urban Walks, inspired from Faro Walks, intend to stimulate the interest on the diverse local heritage in the city and to help to discover it. For that reason pre-defined routes were developed by the municipality in collaboration with local historian and architects.

For the walking tours with the local community pre-designed maps, old archive photos of the heritage sites and other promotional materials were prepared. During the walks these materials were presented at the sites by guides (historians and architects). The tours provided the opportunity to exchange with the participants about the heritage: what they perceive as their heritage and to listen to their stories about the heritage places.

Results & impacts

The planning process of these routes was already a very positive step. It helped to identify and map the diverse urban heritage in the city and establish a common ground and understanding what the urban heritage is about.

The tours themselves helped to enhance the experience of the community and to contribute to a common understanding of the urban heritage in the city and to learn from each other. Due to the success of these walks there is the intention to organise such tours also for tourists.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

To further promote these walks and give further people the chance to experience (citizens, tourists, etc.) the urban heritage, it should be thought about how these tours could be done on their own or self-organised groups i.e. with the help of audio guides and the opportunity to comment and share personal stories on a website later on and even to add own tours.

Further information in the web

<http://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/comus/-/gyumri-heritage-walk-in-the-framework-of-faro>

<http://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/comus/-/faro-walks-in-goris-rain-did-not-make-them-stop-walking>

Contact person

Gyumri City Research Centre, Mr. Ashot MIRZOYAN, ashotmirzoyan@gmail.com

Goris Tourism Information Centre, Ms. Hayarpi AVANESYAN, hayarpi_avanesyan@hotmail.com



Gyumri Urban (Faro) Walk participants on Shiraz Street, 24 September 2016, © Gyumri City Research Centre



Goris Urban (Faro) Walk participants front of "Tsti Bner" (Avant-garde) residential district, 25 September 2016, © Goris Tourism Information Centre NGO

Promotion & valorisation of Urban Heritage

B) Tangible heritage

World Heritage Interpretation Centre, Warsaw, Poland

Objective

The objective of the World Heritage Interpretation Centre is to raise awareness among the local community and educate the general public about World Heritage.

Target group

Residents (both adults and children)

Description of project

In 2013 the Heritage Interpretation Centre was opened in Warsaw as site museum of the historic centre, inscribed to the World Heritage List in 1980. In the permanent display the outstanding universal value (OUV) of the historic centre is presented and explained. But one of the main goals is to have the residents as returning visitors. Thus, a regular public programme is organised targeting at the local community:

- Weekly lectures for individual adults
- Summer city walks for individual adults/families
- Site visits to World Heritage cities for individual adults
- Drop in activities for families
- Programmes for schools (all levels from kindergarten to high school)

These activities aim at educating and sharing knowledge about the history of the city centre, the complex challenge of rebuilding it and theoretical issue regarding the reconstruction of the historic city centre. At the same time heritage from other parts of the World is presented to show the diversity of heritage in the world and that it is equally important. For younger participants the activities were used to teach them how to take responsibility for their heritage (both tangible and intangible).

First activities were weekly presentations (60-75 min.) at the Heritage Interpretation Centre (each Monday) for individual adults about the history of Warsaw, the history of the Old Town and its reconstruction in a broad context. These presentations were followed by presentations about world heritage sites in other parts of Europe, which gathered even a bigger audience.

During summer city walks were added to the programme (every Saturday and Sunday from the early May to the late September) as an alternative to the presentations. Due to the positive response about the presentations and city walks the idea appeared to organise tours to World Heritage sites that had been presented. Thus, in cooperation with a travel agency first site visits were organized. The first one with a group of 20 people to Rome. Now two site visits every year are planned.

The Heritage Interpretation Centre is run by the Museum of Warsaw, financed by the City of Warsaw. The centre has 6 permanent staff members. In addition 3 visitors' services staff, 1 person from Education Department of the Museum of Warsaw, 1 scholar, 1 art historian responsible for public programmes and 1 World Heritage site manager.

Results & impacts

The activities have led to a more engaged local community with deeper knowledge of the history of their World Heritage Site and the importance of heritage in general.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

Key to the success of the single activities were their regularity, always taking place at the same day and time. This helped to build up the audience (what took time). Also very important is to make the activities a fun and enjoyable experience! Also the travel turned out to be a perfect starting point for awareness raising and World Heritage education. Important was also to start with one simple activity and then step by step add new activities to the programme.

With the experience of the participants also more specific and complex topics and information about sites can be introduced; which means at the same time: start with easy to digest information at the beginning!

For the presentations and the other activities it is crucial to acquire people with passion and deep knowledge; take time to find them. In the case of Warsaw lectures have been colleagues working in Museum of Warsaw, lecturers from the universities and ambassadors of selected countries talking about World Heritage sites in their countries.

A challenge was the implementation of 'drop in' activities for families and the programme targeting at schools. Here the support of colleagues from the Education Department of the Museum was very helpful. Together the content was designed, first by deciding what to tell and could be interesting for the children and young adults to know about the World Heritage site they live in and then to think about how to do it in a fun and creative way. As result there are different activities for different age groups. Teachers can book these activities.

Further information in the web

www.ciz.muzeumwarszawy.pl (soon available in English)

Contact person

Museum of Warsaw, Heritage Interpretation Centre, Anna Zasadzińska,
anna.zasadzinska@muzeumwarszawy.pl



O V P M
O W H C
O C P M



Promotion & valorisation of Urban Heritage

B) Tangible heritage

Information station with café and exhibition at the Hufeisensiedlung, Berlin, Germany

Objective

The objectives of the info station with a café and exhibition is to raise the awareness of the importance of the Hufeisensiedlung as World Heritage, especially the criterion that makes it a World Heritage of “Berlin Modernism Housing Estates”. In addition the info station aims to support the preservation of the heritage buildings and to launch cooperation between relevant stakeholders.

Target group

Local residents, property owners, authorities, visitors, World Heritage tourists

Description of project

The info station with a café and exhibition is a contact and meeting point for local residents, visitors and individuals with interest in the world heritage architecture.

In June 2012, the housing estate Deutsche Wohnen AG opened an info station with a café and an exhibition at the Hufeisensiedlung. It is located in a former shop/residential unit. In the context of the program “Nationale Welterbestätten”, initiated by the Germany Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development, the Deutsche Wohnen restored one residential unit with an annexed shop, which has been vacant for a long time. The living room, kitchen furniture and the bathroom have been refitted in line with the original interior, giving a unique impression of life in the Hufeisensiedlung in the 1920s and 1930s.

The annexed shop was converted into an information station with café and an exhibition about the Hufeisensiedlung. The information station is managed on behalf of Deutsche Wohnen by “Ticket B – city tours by architects” (an agency specialised in architectural guided tours) and the citizens association “Friends and Supporters of the Horseshoe Estate, Berlin-Britz”.

The opening of the exhibition and café is made possible by volunteers, who ensure that the info station is open two afternoons a week. The association disseminates information about the World Heritage site and cultural events such as the big street festival once a year.

Results & impacts

As result of the project an information and meeting point was created, at which inhabitants can meet and present their World heritage site to visitors (voluntary work). This fosters the identity of the citizens with the World Heritage site they live in.

The info station allows communicating information about UNESCO and the World Heritage Site, improving the understanding of the idea of the World Heritage convention, raising the awareness and respect of the cultural values and the necessity of protection.

Last but not least a former residential unit was restored to its original setting (color concept, kitchen furniture, bathroom), giving an insight into the life in the Hufeisensiedlung in the 1920s and 1930s, and giving this unit a permanent use.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

The project was a win-win-situation for all parties involved. It can be applied to other housing estates. A combination of different subsidies to the lack of financial resources is to be recommended. Because of the voluntary work the station is opened only two afternoons a week. It is important to open the station continuously.

Further information in the web

www.hufeisensiedlung.info/foederverein/projekte/cafe-und-ausstellung-in-der-info-station.html

www.welterbesiedlungen-berlin.de/en/hufeisensiedlung-genral-information.php

<http://www.ticket-b.de/Unesco-world-heritage-housing-estates-from-the-1920s.html>

Contact person

Dr. Ramona Simone Dornbusch
Landesdenkmalamt Berlin
Welterbereferentin
Klosterstr. 47, 10179 Berlin

Telefon: +49 (0)30 90259-3620
Mobil: +49 (0)151 162 56 482
E-Mail: Ramona.Dornbusch@lda.berlin.de



Aerial view of the Hufeisensiedlung, © Landesdenkmalamt, 2008



Café and exhibition, © Ben Buschfeld, 2015



Info station, © Ben Buschfeld, 2015

Promotion & valorisation of Urban Heritage

C) Targeting at entrepreneurs and young people

Collaboration with entrepreneurs to promote World Heritage sites: Van Wereldformaat – the Amsterdam Canal Ring, De Beemster Polder, the Defence Line of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Objective

Reaching out to entrepreneurs in World Heritage sites to raise their awareness about the World Heritage and make them ambassadors of their World Heritage sites.

Target group

Entrepreneurs in World Heritage
The stories are for a broad audience and will be presented on a website.

Description of project

Since 2011 three Dutch UNESCO World Heritage sites – the Amsterdam Canal Ring, De Beemster Polder and the Defence Line of Amsterdam – collaborate to spread their shared history. Besides writing down the story of the historical and geographical connection of the sites and communicating it in a brochure for a broader audience together with an included cycling tour, several short videos were produced in which the connection is also underlined in visuals.

To reach out for the business sector, entrepreneurs – who undertake their businesses in one of the three sites – were interviewed to tell their story about their undertaking in relationship with the world heritage. In these stories the present and future is connected to the history of the place(s), making the entrepreneurs aware about the cultural heritage, in which their business takes place, and make them capable to tell the story on their own.

In preparation of this project, entrepreneurs in the world heritage sites were identified, which run a business that could be related to the topics of the shared OUV: green and water management and entrepreneurs which have a sustainable working method. To activate the entrepreneurs to take part in the interviews, it was explained to them what is in for them (PR about their business) and that they only have to invest a little time for the interview and share their story online. All stories are to be published on a special website.

Results & impacts

A website on which the different stories of entrepreneurship in world heritage are shared, in particular through the entrepreneurs' networks themselves (websites, social media).

By reaching out to the entrepreneurs and making them aware that they have their business in a world heritage site and asking them to share their story in relation to this fact, they become ambassadors of the World Heritage Sites.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

Do not underestimate the investment of time to prepare this project and do the interviews.


Further information in the web

webpage www.vanwereldformaat.nl under construction

Contact person

World Heritage Office Amsterdam, Inez Weyermans, i.weyermans@amsterdam.nl
Municipality of Beemster Janneke van Dijk, j.v.dijk@purmerend.nl

1. Logo Van Wereldformaat – Of world stature



2. Map with the three world heritage sites



4. Entrepreneurs of Peerby at Amsterdam Canal Ring
Peerby enables you to borrow the things you need from people in your neighborhood
More information www.peerby.com



3. Entrepreneur Frank Bart of Fort Resort Beemster at Zuidoostbeemster
More information www.fortresortbeemster.nl

Promotion & valorisation of Urban Heritage

C) Targeting at entrepreneurs and young people

World Heritage Education Program, Philadelphia, USA

Objective

The objective of the World Heritage Education Program is to teach children about World Heritage: what the world has given to Philadelphia and what Philadelphia has given to the world in terms of heritage

Target group

Youth 10-17 years old

Description of project

On May 4-6, 2016, the Philadelphia World Heritage Education Working Group launched a World Heritage Education Program at Andrew Jackson School, a public school in South Philadelphia. Prior to the event, staff from the global centers of University of Pennsylvania trained participating teachers on how to effectively create and implement lesson plans specific to world regions. Trainers provided teachers with the Philadelphia World Heritage Toolkit—a workbook consisting of 35 lesson plans related to World Heritage studies and global education for K-12th grade. Utilizing these resources, teachers facilitated new learning experiences for students in their classrooms. Students also had the opportunity to explore the unique history of their city, visit several cultural institutions, and learn about different cultures from native speakers. While this program was sure to create fun and meaningful experiences for students, the students gained a deeper understanding of their cultural value as well as their role in the larger world.

Results & impacts

- 100%** of teachers found that World Heritage Week activities increased student understanding on world regions.
- 100%** thought World Heritage Education Week was a helpful tool in teaching global education.
- 60%** stated that World Heritage Week festival exceeded their expectations.
- 100%** felt students benefited from the cultural and educational performances/presentations displayed at the festival.
- 75%** answered “Definitely yes” to the question, “After attending the professional development day session on World Heritage education, would feel comfortable incorporating World Heritage education techniques into your classroom.”
- 100%** would recommend participation in this program to a colleague.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

This project was very time demanding that requires a collaborative team, detail-oriented staff, and invested organizations that are willing to donate in-kind resources to keep costs as low as possible. The students and educators reported that they had a positive experience and that this was a creative vehicle to inform students about global cultures and Philadelphia’s World Heritage City designation. Surveys were distributed, but, unfortunately, every participating teacher did not complete it. Thus, it is recommended that teachers complete surveys on-site the last day of the program to ensure responses from all participants. Also it is recommended surveying students.

Further information in the web

<http://globalphiladelphia.org/>

Contact person

Global Philadelphia Association, World Heritage Coordinator, Nikia Brown,
nikia.brown@globalphiladelphia.org



O V P M
O W H C
O C P M



© Pictures: Global Philadelphia Association

Promotion & valorisation of Urban Heritage

C) Targeting at entrepreneurs and young people

Lodge for young people – voluntary year in monument preservation, Quedlinburg, Germany

Objective

The voluntary year in monument preservation 'Lodge for Young People' provides youngsters the opportunity to become familiar with the multifaceted working areas in heritage management and preservation in a personality building and vocation-orienting year.

Target group

Young people aged between 16 and 27 years old.

Description of project

The Stonemasons' Lodge for Young People (JBH), which started as a pilot project in Quedlinburg in 1999, is the offer of the German Foundation for Monument Protection to carry out a voluntary year in monument preservation. Spurred on by the success of this pilot project in Quedlinburg and thanks to many partners, sponsors and donors, the foundation is currently operating thirteen similar JBH across Germany. Young people aged between 16 and 27 years are completing a voluntary year in assignments with craftsmen, architects, archaeologists, archives, associations and institutions under the guidance of International Youth Community Services (ijgd). For this purpose they work in companies and institutions which are active in the preservation of monuments and are familiarized with relevant topics. The young people learn respectful dealing with achievements of previous generations and confidence in their own abilities. Their joint one-week courses are devoted to practical project work under professional supervision. A number of architectural monuments in Quedlinburg were carefully restored under professional guidance by the young people, such as today's guest house in the Goldstraße or the Klopstock summer house at Schlossberg.

Results & impacts

Young people have been introduced to topics of monument protection, World Heritage and crafts in monument protection. They obtain skills for their job life, being the next generation in preserving monuments and to protect the world heritage.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

Motivated and technically competent trainers are required to inspire young people for the topics of monument protection, world heritage and crafts.

Further information in the web

www.denkmalschutz.de

www.ijgd.de

Contact person

Andrea Friedrich
FSJ Kultur in der Denkmalpflege
Jugendbauhütte Quedlinburg
ijgd LV Sachsen-Anhalt e.V.
Westendorf 26
38820 Halberstadt

Telefon: (+49) 03941 - 5652 -21
Telefax: (+49) 03941 - 5652 -52
Email: andrea.friedrich@ijgd.de



O V P M
O W H C
O C P M

Quedlinburg Jugendbauhütte



Quedlinburg Stiftskirche

The Bank of Materials, Porto, Portugal

Objective

The Bank of Materials aims to actively engage citizens in the conservation and careful use of their urban heritage. It raises the awareness of citizens about safeguarding rules and procedures.

Target group

Citizens, owners, pupils and students, municipal services.

Description of project

The Bank of Materials, situated in the Palace of the Viscounts of Balsemão, a former private building today belonging to the city, is a museum open to the public since 2010. Since more than 25 years it has been saving Porto's typical building material from destruction by collecting and cataloguing it for research purpose. In addition it offers these materials free of charge to citizens for the authentic rehabilitation of their heritage buildings, contributing to the safeguarding of the city's architectural heritage. The Bank of Materials also safeguards knowledge about azulejos and the visual memories of the city. Azulejos are very typical of Spanish and Portuguese architecture. They are painted tin-glazed ceramic tiles on the interior and exterior of buildings. In the past, they were not only used as an ornamental art form, but also to control the temperature in the homes.

Municipal services, such as the emergency management, fire brigade and municipal company of housing and management, collect architecturally important materials at risk and bring them to the Bank of Materials. Citizens and owners can also take initiative by bringing materials to the bank. Exceptionally, bank staff members collect materials at the place of origin when asked.

The bank also provides materials to citizens: any owner of a building in Porto can contact the bank, asking for missing traditional materials for a proper rehabilitation of the façade. If the bank has the missing material, the citizen can go to the Citizens' Office at city hall to formalise the request in writing. If the bank does not have the requested material, a list of factories capable of reproducing the material is given to the citizen.

The rarest materials are destined for the bank museum fund for didactical and learning purposes. The Bank of Materials has also been registering ceramic typological elements (more than 4,000 entries in the catalogue) and has identified where they can be found. This systematic study shows the high value of the tile assets in Porto and the diversity of used materials. Technical support for researchers and the general public is provided.

For citizens the museum organises guided visits and workshops to learn about the techniques and evolution of materials used in the local built heritage and how the materials can be restored. In addition it promotes training and educational activities for schools.

Results & impacts

Since the bank's opening as a museum in 2010, 15,000 pieces have been collected and more than 7,300 pieces provided for building's façade restoration. At least 100 buildings were rehabilitated and more than 1,400 benefited from technical support from the Bank of Materials. The museum has welcomed more than 21,000 visitors since 2010.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

The concept of the Bank of Materials can be adapted to any city or region, which aims to preserve its unique building elements and therefore its visual identity. Key tips include:

- find enough space to accommodate all the collected materials;
- achieve that the different municipal services collaborate with the Bank of Materials;
- promote and showcase the bank's actions to make it a recognised part of the city's identity;
- actively involve and support citizens and owners in their preservation attempts, making them part of the process to create cultural opportunity.

Further information in the web

<http://bit.ly/2mq6R6A> and <http://bit.ly/2msA9DI>

Contact person

Paula Araujo Pereira da Silva – Head of Museums and Cultural Heritage Department in Porto's municipality –

paulaasilva@cm-porto.pt



© Bank of Materials



Living with Cultural Heritage, Rauma, Finland

Objective

The goal of the project 'Living with Cultural Heritage' is that the participants learn from each other how to live, maintain and cherish a historical town, while preserving its characteristic environment and liveability.

Target group

Local inhabitants, cultural heritage and urban planning officers, tourism management, visitors, craftsmen

Description of project

The starting point for all actions and activities of 'Living with Cultural Heritage' is the natural and cultural heritage, sustainable tourism and a community-based and participative approach.

Key of the project is the empowerment of the local house owners, who nurture privately owned World Heritage. For this LiviHeri (European exchange project) has developed an „open door“ concept for visitors to be accommodated in or visit these local World Heritage houses in Old Rauma, Visby and Kuldiga. Thus, visitors can experience living in cultural heritage and the owner shares his/her experience about conservation practices in daily routines.

In support of this, international restoration workshops have been organised to revive the craftsmen skills related to conservation. This knowledge is shared with the partner towns to sustain their cultural history value and turn it into a tourist attraction. The workshops are also a tourist attraction themselves: tourists and local people are invited to visit the sites and meet the craftsmen. The activities are reported and shared in social media, so that anyone can join the workshop as viewer and commentator.

Results & impacts

The project has helped to build up the capacity of conserving the outstanding universal values, recognized as World Heritage values, in Old Rauma, Visby and Kuldiga with the support of all partners.

Reviving the craftsmen skills related to conservation and sharing this knowledge between the partners has enhanced the partner towns capacities to sustain their cultural historic value and to turn it into a tourist attraction. In addition, the exchange led to a cross-border pooling of traditional building skills and services within the (Baltic) region.

House owners have gained income with tourist through this project and built up their capacity heritage interpretation and place identity.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

This kind of activity need human resources for networking with the community. It is a joint learning and sharing process between equal experts of cultural heritage.

Further information in the web

<https://liviheri.wordpress.com/>

Twitter: @LiviHeri

Instagram: liviheri

Facebook: @liviheri

Contact person

Rauma Town, Laura Puolamäki laura.puolamaki@rauma.fi



*Wähä-Pildola house has opened its doors for visitors.
© Laura Puolamäki, Rauma Town*



*Urban excavations in Old Rauma were open for visitors during the International Day of Archaeology.
© Oona Jalonen, Muuritutkimus ky*



*Restoration workshop in Aizpute, Latvia.
© Janis Tolpeznikovs, SERDE*

Ziemeļblāzma Culture Palace, Riga, Latvia

Objective

The safeguarding and revitalisation of a deprived heritage building site (Ziemeļblāzma) to provide space for cultural and recreational activities for the neighbourhood and artists as well as strengthening public participation in the governance of cultural activities and heritage.

Target group

Local communities, NGOs, tourists, foundations, media, volunteers.

Description of project

Built in 1913, located in a remote working-class area in the north of the city, Ziemeļblāzma was a roofless building in poor condition with crumbling walls and no water supply. The surrounding park was overgrown and unsafe. After the state-owned building was transferred to the city, reconstruction began in 2011 to achieve full restoration in 2013 as a multifunctional cultural centre. The regeneration of the area and the renovation of the Culture Palace went hand in hand with the city's bid to become European Capital of Culture in 2014. The "Active Neighbourhoods" series of events as part of the European Capital of Culture programme, also implemented in Ziemeļblāzma, gave great impetus to public participation.

Today Ziemeļblāzma is a sophisticated art centre and a platform for generating innovative ideas, hosting cultural activities and presentations, also being a tourist attraction. The Palace boasts a five-hectare park, used not only as a recreational area but also as an outdoor cultural venue.

The cultural complex is managed by a director and staff accountable to the municipality. The stakeholders involved in the planning of the programme of the site are youth and cultural organisations, companies, non-profit associations, foundations and media. They form a working group that regularly meets to discuss paramount issues of activities, directions and planning, as well as general problems. The organisation collects feedback through questionnaires, in particular from first-time attendees, which allows obtaining consistent information and adapting working methods and channels to disseminate information. Many volunteers are involved and their contribution is indispensable.

70% of the events are free of charge. For the remaining 30% the entrance fees are much lower than those in the city centre, taking account of discounts for students, retirees, children, and free admission for disabled people.

The project is part of a long-term process of urban development based on a creative quarter.

Results & impacts

Ziemeļblāzma is a noteworthy example of the regeneration of a declining urban area. The Culture Palace is contributing to the development of the neighbourhood. It is a resource for trying out and implementing new methods that leaves a positive impact on the development of the community and the local social situation. It has highly contributed to the establishments of relationships with the neighbourhood and other stakeholders, especially NGOs and amateur associations.

As of 2015, Ziemeļblāzma welcomed around 71,000 visitors for live performances, festivals and exhibitions. The park is a very popular recreational area and Ziemeļblāzma has helped to build relationships between attendees, local organisations and NGOs. Also the revitalisation has contributed to make the area safer, combining increasing attendance and traffic - making the area busier and less isolated - and greater social cohesion through the governance model.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

The project's sustainability depends on how citizens take ownership of the space. Although the operation requires strong government support, success can only be achieved if it is a popular space for the neighbours, users and participants. Conferences and public discussions have helped to sustainably manage the project.

The initial public investment in the restoration was key for the development of the site. But the risk that the amortisation of expenses/maintenance costs does not match the resources needed to finance current activities is existing. Here a long time financing strategy is needed.

Further information in the web

<http://bit.ly/2mOwmBk>

Contact person

Inita Andžāne, Ziemeļblāzma's Director, ziemelblazma@riga.lv



© RigaLET_LETA



Unionviertel Creative Quarter, Dortmund, Germany

Objective

The objective was to redevelop and rehabilitate a socially deprived, former industrial heritage area and create a new creative quarter attracting cultural and creative industries.

Target group

Cultural and creative industries, entrepreneurs, students, tourists, citizens.

Description of project

The Unionviertel around the old Union brewery, an industrial heritage site, is one of the creative quarters of the Ruhr area and home to Dortmund's iconic symbol, the 'Dortmunder U', a centre for art and creativity in the former brewery. The Creative Quarter Unionviertel was set up by the city of Dortmund in collaboration with the region and civil society in 2015, and has since then attracted numerous artists and creatives, along with workshops, art galleries and cultural initiatives. An urban district cooperative offers a framework for the various activities in the district, for example leasing vacancies to interest creative operators for reasonable prices, as well as coordinating cultural events and activities and promoting the visibility of the creative quarter.

The Unionviertel already had natural advantages as a potential creative quarter: it is close to the city centre, has good transport connections and was already home to the cultural lighthouse of the 'Dortmunder U'. The presence of the Union-Gewerbehof, a start-up centre for cultural and creative industries in a former industrial site, also helped to lay the groundwork for the creative quarter. Despite these assets the area was in need for renovation and redevelopment with many vacant industrial and residential buildings. The area was socially deprived with a mixed population. During the development of the area into a creative quarter many of these perceived disadvantages have become key factors in attracting creative operators. For example, the high availability of working spaces attracted creative and cultural innovators due to affordable rents.

The project ensures the involvement of partners and local stakeholders through various mechanisms. There is an advisory board made up of representatives from the region, the municipality, the university of Dortmund and the chambers of craft, industry and commerce. The board meets quarterly. There is also a roundtable to which all creatives in the Unionviertel are invited – around 100 creative players were invited to the first meeting with 80% of them joining. This incredibly high uptake showed the interest of local actors to be involved in their area.

Alongside these involvement activities, an incubator was created to provide training to initiatives, projects and businesses in the creative sector, as well as support in finding affordable space and amplifying activities through marketing and networking. A coordinating centre, HUB-Unionviertel, was also established as a platform for networking and the promotion of interdisciplinary and intercultural exchanges. The centre also supports creative businesses with practical matters and helps put them in touch with local cultural institutions, universities, academies and funding bodies.

Results & impacts

The project has reduced significantly the amount of vacant living and work spaces. Industrial and residential buildings have been rehabilitated to create an attractive living environment, in particular targeting at small businesses in the cultural and creative sector. This allowed to develop clusters in the realm of digital media, music and design and creative spill-over effects in the form of tourism and gastronomy. In addition the area offers cultural and leisure activities.

As the project is still ongoing, it is too soon to draw conclusions on long-term impacts, but in the short-term the demand for living and working spaces in the area has increased significantly, and numerous artists and creative operators have moved into the area, in particular small businesses and start-ups. The cultural and leisure offer has also expanded through the actions of both the project and other stakeholders who have been attracted to the area. The perception of the Unionviertel in Dortmund and further has become more positive, in no small part due to the role of the Dortmunder U as iconic feature of the city skyline and 'symbol' for the area.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

An essential prerequisite for the positive development of the project was the intensive and broad work in a network. The institutional cooperation between the urban disciplines of economic development, urban regeneration and culture is to be mentioned first and foremost. The inclusion of civil society institutions and actors anchored in the district, as well as the integration of the Dortmund universities and the business sector as well as the state ministries, was carried out by “roundtables” and an advisory council. This constructive partnership is the most important factor in the success of the project. In addition, the role of the Dortmund U as a multifunctional facility and as a building with a city-defining significance is fundamental for identification with the Union district and its creative economic profile.

A problem of the project conception is the refinancing of the so-called “unprofitable costs”, such as marketing, consulting, events and cultural happenings. But these “soft factors” are also indispensable for the attractiveness of the neighbourhood and the project. It has also become apparent that there is not enough demand for the general qualification and training measures offered, especially if they have to be paid. Adapted case- or application-related offers for the concrete creative business and companies are more compatible with the demand. Likewise, general advertising campaigns for potential prospects of the project showed little resonance; rather, a targeted and differentiated approach is more successful - for example with universities and students.

Municipalities that want to implement a similar project are strongly recommended to establish a close network in the above sense and to agree on a close cooperation, in particular with universities, because creative economy start-ups occur mainly in the field of student and academic institutions. In addition, a “creative quarter” must not only be appealing with regards to affordable work space, but above all should also have stimulating leisure and cultural facilities with the quality of life that comes with them. A place or a building with an identity-creating effect is also important to the interior and exterior perception of the neighbourhood, acting almost as a “symbol”, increasing the wider attractiveness of the creative quarter.

Further information in the web

<http://unionviertel.de/>

Contact person

City of Dortmund Culture Department, Kurt Eichler, keichler@stadtdo.de



© Adolf Winkelmann



© Hannes Woidich

Participative development of actions, management plans, guidelines, policies for Urban Heritage

Youth activist school, Zhovkva, Ukraine

Objective

The objective of the 'activists school' is to provide relevant information about the city and its heritage to active community members in order to collect ideas from them for the development of the urban heritage.

Target group

Local school activists

Description of project

The Youth Activists School in Zhovkva was a full four day school programme, presenting and discussing following topics:

1. History, cultural heritage and prominent personalities of Zhovkva,
2. Local government, politics and public utilities,
3. Business, investment and grants,
4. Basic of project management and brainstorming.

During the first session the participants received basic information on the town history, about the most important cultural heritage objects and prominent personalities of Zhovkva from its foundation to the present. In the afternoon the school members had an excursion and visited several heritage sites, in particular the ones not accessible for tourism so far.

During the second session, participants talked with local officials to become more familiar with the work of the city council, the formation of the local budget and decision-making. Further the participants talked about municipal enterprises (also responsible for the cultural heritage) and discussed ways to improve their work. The activists visited some of the enterprises.

During the third session, three types of investments in Zhovkva (urban heritage) were discussed: public, private and grants. After the discussion the participants visited five private enterprises with foreign investments in Zhovkva.

In the fourth session, in addition to receiving further information about project management, the participants got acquainted with special aspects of the city and with the international concept of "right to the city" (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Right_to_the_city). Based on this the participants drew «rich pictures», working in groups: two groups draw Zhovkva today related to their urban heritage, the other two the «dream city». Thus, it was identified the situation of today and the vision for the future of the city based on the urban heritage. Part of that session was a SWOT-analysis and the development of a problem tree.

This all led to the development of ideas for the development of Zhovkva's urban heritage based on the youth perspective.

Results & impacts

30 Zhovkva youth activists became familiar with basic information about the town, the cultural heritage, they met with local authorities and become familiar with the basics of local politics and the investment climate in Zhovkva.

Through the media and social networks about 500 Zhovkva residents were informed about the results of the activists school.

Through the presentation of the results to local authorities they achieved a better understanding of the desires and ideas of the youth related to the urban and heritage development. This should feed into local policies for urban and cultural heritage development.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

In Ukrainian cities it is most often the situation that residents and youth do not have sufficient information about basic aspects of city life and the urban heritage: they do not know their history, have low awareness of the value of their cultural heritage. But people want to improve their living conditions and are ready to participate in activities to improve the city.

Here local authorities and NGOs can take an active educational and communicational role to involve residents and youth in the development of ideas, projects and policies for the urban development based on the cultural heritage. Also the business sector should be involved.

Further information in the web

Not yet available

Contact person

Olena Klak, NGO Zhovkva town development center, executive director, klak.olena@gmail.com



The first session in Zhovkva castle. Foto by Olena Klak



Discovering the local cultural heritage. Foto by Olena Klak

Participative development of actions, management plans, guidelines, policies for Urban Heritage

Table de concertation du Vieux-Québec

Objective

The *Table de concertation du Vieux-Québec* aims to establish a consensus on the orientations, interventions and actions to be implemented in order to ensure a balanced development of the historic district.

Target group

All actors who influence the quality of life and the future of Vieux-Québec.

Description of project

Established by the City of Québec in 2012 as a follow-up on previous community initiatives, *the Table de concertation du Vieux-Québec* is an ideal forum for exchanging information and coordinating actions to make the historic district more attractive to residents, workers and visitors.

The *Table* is made up of roughly twenty people representing the principal stakeholders in the district's community : citizens, educational and health institutions, cultural organizations, retailers, hoteliers, government departments and agencies (provincial and federal). It holds five to six meetings annually and is presided by the vice-chair of the City's Executive Committee.

A first action plan was drawn up early in 2013 followed by a forum held in 2014 which brought together some 100 participants invited to develop a vision of the district for the next 15 years. This activity led the *Table's* members to agree on a major objective: to increase the population living in the historic core by 500 residents over a five-year horizon. It was also an opportunity to collect a multitude of ideas for actions likely to contribute to this objective.

Subsequently, in 2015 and 2016, the *Table* adopted an action plan for the next five years. The main objectives of this plan address the following issues: housing, shops and services, mobility, arts and culture, communication and promotion, tourism and heritage. This action plan acknowledges that the City cannot be the sole carrier of these actions, several are taken on by the other members of the *Table*.

Results & impacts

1. The *Table* has provided a space for communication between the stakeholders which was previously nonexistent or discontinued. It facilitates the flow of information and contributes to the improvement of the quality of life through swifter and more fluid mediation of minor problems. It has also contributed to increasing all concerned parties' awareness of the benefits of keeping the district lively and inhabited.
2. Bringing together the principal stakeholders has led to joint initiatives and previously untapped partnerships, for example, between merchant groups and cultural organizations (to the benefit of the residents and those who work in the district), or between educational institutions and property owners (exploring the potential for redevelopment of vacant existing buildings).
3. Several studies and surveys have been carried out on issues related to heritage management and planning (evolution of land values, demographic changes, residents' needs and aspirations, comfort and safety of pedestrians and cyclists, planning regulations, commercial supply and demand ...). Some of these studies have helped to better understand the issues and guide the decision-making process, while others have helped to establish facts and contradict some false widespread beliefs about the neighborhood.
4. The representativeness of the participants, their credibility and the climate of trust established between them after a few years has enabled some of the stakeholders involved to consult the *Table* early in the planning process of projects concerning the district, collecting the first reactions and suggestions to improve these projects.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

This experience demonstrates that consultation, collaboration and concertation become powerful tools for the convergence of actions carried out by various stakeholders if common objectives are agreed on.

The contributing success factors for Québec City were a strong political will and involvement of elected officials, as well as professional and clerical staff dedicated to supporting the activities, ordering the studies and following up on meetings.

Further information in the web

http://www.ville.quebec.qc.ca/citoyens/vieuxquebec/plan_action_table.aspx

Contact person

Odile Roy, Architect
Director, Architecture and Heritage Department
Ville de Québec
Urban planning and development
295, boulevard Charest Est, bureau 162
Québec (Québec) G1K 3G8

Phone : (418) 641-6411, poste 2120
Fax : (418) 641-6455
Odile.Roy@ville.quebec.qc.ca



*Place-Royale:
site of Québec's foundation in 1608*



*Monument celebrating Vieux-Québec's
recognition as UNESCO's world heritage*



Quebec, busy street



*Rue Saint-Denis:
a residential street bordering the Citadelle*



Quebec, calm street

Participative development of actions, management plans, guidelines, policies for Urban Heritage

Stralsund's World Heritage Advisory Board

Objective

Involvement of people of the civic society in safeguarding, promoting and managing the urban heritage. Capacity building within the local community

Target group

City administration, city council and citizens

Description of project

In 2013, one year after inscription in the World Heritage List, the World Heritage Advisory Board was appointed by the mayor of Stralsund in order to advise and support citizens and the municipal administration in matters related to World Heritage. The board has been embodied in the city's main statutes, thus it has a legal status.

The task of the board is to advise and support the mayor and its administration as well as the city council in the management of the World Heritage site.

The Advisory Board consists of 15 members and meets once per month in closed session. The members discuss current issues related to the World Heritage, make suggestions, give valuable input to the work of the municipality and promote the World Heritage idea as such.

Members come from different fields such as culture, politics, business, museum, tourism, churches, education, architecture, monument preservation.

Results & impacts

The World Heritage Advisory Board has become an essential partner for the city administration and the WH management.

The board helps to build up a network within the city and to promote the World Heritage idea.

The board sets topic on its agenda which are relevant for the positive development of the World Heritage site.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

In order to support a frank discussion about topics related to the World Heritage management closed meetings turned out to be effective.

It is useful to take the minutes on every session.

It proved successful to appoint members from a wide range of different fields of civic life.

Further information in the web

www.wismar-stralsund.de/en/protecting_world_heritage/stakeholders/

Contact person

Hanseatic City of Stralsund, Steffi Behrendt,
sbeherndt@stralsund.de



On the occasion of the 100th session.

© Hanseatic City of Stralsund,
 Photographer: Peter Koslik



Impression of a working session in the town hall

© Hanseatic City of Stralsund,
 Photographer: Steffi Behrendt



On the occasion of the 50th session

© Hanseatic City of Stralsund,
 Photographer: Peter Koslik

Participative development of actions, management plans, guidelines, policies for Urban Heritage

World Heritage Citizens Dialogue, Regensburg, Germany

Objective

The World Heritage Dialogue was organised to consult the general public in the development of Regensburg World Heritage Management Plan in order to identify citizens' needs and recommendations for actions in relation to the World Heritage site.

Target group

Citizens of Regensburg;
Representatives of various interest groups.

Description of project

During the development of the integrated Regensburg World Heritage Management Plan, the principle of participation led to the initiation of a citizens dialogue forum. Through a two-day workshop over the weekend citizens and various interests groups of the civil society in Regensburg were invited to discuss the development of the World Heritage area. More than 70 citizens, representing a broad cross-section of the public, participated and expressed their ideas for the historic centre and put forward their recommendations for action.

To inform citizens about the development of the management plan and to invite them to the World Heritage Dialogue an information evening was organised, leaflets were printed and an information desk at the Christmas market in the old town set up.

The workshop started with a general introduction about the objective and the participative elaboration process of the World Heritage management plan. Afterwards moderated working groups for each field of action of the management plan were established. The citizens could freely chose, which working group to join. During the first day in the working groups, the needs of the participants related to the theme of the working group were identified. Requests for improvement were discussed to determine the most important issues. During the second day, the working groups developed potential action to meet these needs. Together the most significant actions were defined and afterwards presented in the plenum to the other working groups.

After the workshop the proposed key actions of the working groups were discussed in the task group, responsible for the development of the management plan, concerning the viability of their implementation. The result of the discussion, which actions will be integrated in the World Heritage management plan and which not, were documented and published (brochure) on the Regensburg website. Printed copies were available in the town hall. For each action not to be taken over in the management plan a detailed reason for the denial was given. In addition, during the citizens workshop, two representatives of the local community were elected and became part of the task group "Management Plan" and acted as "Godfathers" of the public needs.

Results & impacts

The World Heritage Dialogue brought up various ideas and concrete actions contributing to the attractiveness and quality of life of the old town of Regensburg. 50% of the recommendations for action from the citizens were included in the management plan. Many of them have been implemented by now.

The installed representatives of the citizens workshop have become active members of the task group "Management Plan", representing the public needs.

Lessons learnt & recommendations

- Expect ideas that are absolutely out of your initial range, but treat all suggested measures equally
- Try actively to invite a broad sketch of citizens amongst all social ranks
- Have a responsible chairperson for each of your working groups that is capable of professional group moderation
- Explain in the beginning of the workshop what is going to happen with the results of the workshops and what is expected of the participants.
- Document and publish the results of the workshop to be transparent.

Further information in the web

<http://www.regensburg.de/unesco-world-heritage/coordination/project-development-andcoordination/management-plan>

Contact person

City of Regensburg - World Heritage Coordination
Matthias Ripp
+49-941-507 4614

Ripp.Matthias@regensburg.de



All photos © City of Regensburg

PART IV – Outlook

Community Involvement as a key strategy for heritage-based urban development

by Matthias Ripp –
World Heritage Coordination Regensburg

Our understanding of cultural heritage is changing: From spectacular monuments that were listed in the beginning of the preservation-movement around Europe, we are now widening and broadening our understanding of cultural heritage.

At the moment, Europe is preparing for 2018, what the European Commission proposed to be the European Year of Cultural Heritage. Being involved in preparatory activities on different levels, we are facing the most important question: What do we understand by “cultural heritage” in the 21st century? We as experts, we as society, we as a part of governance systems which are playing a major role in the decision-making, funding, communication, involvement etc.



Urban Heritage in Potsdam ©MatthiasRipp

The idea for the new European Year of Cultural Heritage was in the beginning driven by the huge success of the 1975 Architectural Heritage Year which was crucial to enhance and expand the whole sector of conservation, including the installation of governmental bodies, new laws, the establishment of new scientific institutions etc. The text of the ICOMOS Charta drafted as a direct result, is focusing on the built tangible heritage and calls for integrated conservation. But it included already explicit references to other dimensions and the role for the society:

“ ...

2. The past as embodied in the architectural heritage provides the sort of environment indispensable to a balanced and complete life.”(...)
3. The architectural heritage is a capital of irreplaceable spiritual, cultural, social and economic value.(...)
4. The structure of historic centres and sites is conducive to a harmonious social balance (...)
5. The architectural heritage has an important part to play in education. ...” (European Charter of the Architectural Heritage - 1975)

UNESCO defines cultural heritage by three different categories:

1. Cultural heritage:

• Tangible cultural heritage:

- movable cultural heritage (paintings, sculptures, coins, manuscripts)
- immovable cultural heritage (monuments, archaeological sites, and so on)
- underwater cultural heritage (shipwrecks, underwater ruins and cities)

• Intangible cultural heritage:

- oral traditions, performing arts, rituals

2. Natural heritage: natural sites with cultural aspects such as cultural landscapes, physical, biological or geological formations

3. Heritage in the event of armed conflict (definition of the cultural heritage, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation)

www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/illicit-traffic-ficking-of-cultural-property/unesco-database-of-national-cultural-heritage-laws/frequently-asked-questions/definition-of-the-cultural-heritage/



UNESCO World Heritage City Regensburg ©MatthiasRipp

In 2005 the “Faro” Convention was introduced, Council of Europe’s Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, which states in Article 1, c (Aims of the Conventions) , that “the conservation of cultural heritage and its sustainable use have human development and quality of life as their goal;” Consequently the definition of cultural heritage is much wider:

Article 2 – Definitions

For the purposes of this Convention,

a) cultural heritage is a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time;

b) a heritage community consists of people who value specific aspects of cultural heritage which they wish, within the framework of public action, to sustain and transmit to future generations.

So now the use and function of cultural heritage for society and (with reference to Hartmut Rosa) a sort of resonance between the two enter the stage. Of course it was always there, but in 2005 it was finally recognised.

The current scientific discussion seems to shift from an object-based understanding towards a more holistic understanding of cultural heritage as for example William Logan and Laurajane Smith used it in the foreword of their recent publication “Urban Heritage, Development and Sustainability. International Frameworks, National and Local Governance”(2016):

“...within the new field that sees ‘heritage’ as a social and political construct encompassing all those places, artefacts and cultural expressions inherited from the past which, because they are seen to reflect and validate our identity as nations, communities, families and even individuals, are worthy of some form of respect and protection.” (Smith, L., Logan, W.: Series editor’s foreword. In: Labadia, S., Logan, W.: Urban Heritage, Development and Sustainability. 2016, p. xiii)

We as heritage experts can see and feel this shift all around us. It becomes more and more evident, and by that the role of the “users” of heritage is also altering. The almost traditional system of defining what cultural heritage is through academic experts and then explaining its values to the local communities and other users (tourists) seems to no longer be sufficient for all situations.



Users of Urban Heritage in Bamberg ©Matthias Ripp

One reason might be that during the beginning of the preservation movement the cultural system in which preservation activities were embedded was more homogenous than it is today. We better speak of cultures than of culture when we describe the settings and systems for cultural heritage and this acknowledges that we have a larger variety of interests, uses and motivations among those who have to take care of the cultural heritage and are using and (hopefully) benefitting from it.

Another fact is that our understanding of communication has changed. While early theories of communication mainly used the „sender-receiver“

linear structure, today through the use of social media and other opportunities, our understanding of communication is more of a complex system, where messages go in each direction, sometimes in a chaotic and uncontrolled manner. This is of course also the case for heritage communication. So as a result of this changing world we can note that:

- A more holistic understanding of cultural heritage is gaining ground.
- The role of (local) communities in connection with cultural heritage is more important than ever.
- Our understanding of communication has developed from linear one-way concepts to systemic, complex and chaotic processes.

These three trends are the most important reasons why the involvement of communities in the field of heritage is more important than ever. Scientific publications, policy documents and reports published by international organisations involved in Cultural Heritage are giving more attention to the role of communities. On the level of tools there exists a large variety of analogue and digital means that can be used in community involvement. What was missing is a model that can be used to scope and structure local community involvement processes, and all of them of course start with communication. For this reason we included the article on the COBA Model (Communication Model for Built Heritage Assets) on [page 22](#) in this publication.

It can be of help to all those practitioners that have to manage or facilitate community involvement processes, either in a less intense way of engaging the citizen mainly through information or in a deeper way including participatory actions. To read further into this topic, we suggest having a look at the new COMUS final brochure 'Communities at the heart of heritage governance' (on the COMUS website <http://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/comus/>). Let's join our forces to further professionalize our policies, strategies and tools on community involvement in urban heritage to reach the final objective: a profound understanding of the importance of our traditions and cultural heritage, the communal will to preserve what composes our heritage and finally encompassing in the improvement of the quality of life for all.



Members of the local Community in Old Part of Shanghai
©MatthiasRipp

Literature:

Dolff-Bonekämper, G. (2009). *The Social and Spatial Frameworks of Heritage: What is New in the Faro Convention?. Heritage and beyond*, 69-74.

Ripp, M., & Rodwell, D. (2015). *The Geography of Urban Heritage. The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice*, 6(3), 240-276.

Ripp, M., & Rodwell, D. (2016). *The Governance of Urban Heritage. The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice*, 7(1), 81-108.

Rosa, H. (2016). *Resonanz: Eine Soziologie der Weltbeziehung*. Suhrkamp Verlag.

Smith, L., Logan, W.: Series editor's foreword. In: Labadia, S., Logan, W.: *Urban Heritage, Development and Sustainability*. 2016, p. xiii

Definition of Cultural Heritage by UNESCO:

www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/illicit-trafficking-of-cultural-property/unesco-database-of-national-cultural-heritage-laws/frequently-asked-questions/definition-of-the-cultural-heritage/

European Charter of the Architectural Heritage – 1975:

<http://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/chartersand-standards/170-european-charter-of-the-architectural-heritage>

*"Unesco World Heritage Site Regensburg"
© City of Regensburg*



PART V – Bibliography

Further reading

- Albert, M.-T.; Richon, M.; Viñals, M. J.; Witcomb, A. (eds., 2012): *Community development through World Heritage; World Heritage papers Vol. 3*
- Alshboul, Kh. (thesis, 2016): *Community-Based Cultural Heritage Resources Management*
- Berkes, F. (2007): *Adaptive Co-Management and Complexity: Exploring the Many Faces of Co-Management*
- Adaptive co-management: collaboration, learning, and multi-level governance*, University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver, pp. 19-37.
- Brown, J.; Hay-Edie, T. (2014): *Engaging Local Communities in Stewardship of World Heritage; World Heritage papers Vol. 4*
- Brown, J.; Hay-Edie, T. (eds, 2013): *Engaging Local Communities in Stewardship of World Heritage; COMPACT UNDP*
- Chan, P.Y. (thesis, 2016): *Community participation in heritage management: a case in Macau*
- Chirikure, S.; Pwiti, G. (2008): *Community Involvement in Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Management: An Assessment from Case Studies in Southern Africa and Elsewhere; in: Current Anthropology, Vol. 49, No. 3, pp. 467-485*
- Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources in association with Comanagement Boards and Advisory Committees, South Australia (2015): Strong People, Strong Country: Co-managing parks in South Australia*
- European Expert Network on Culture (2015): Mapping of practices in the EU Member States on Participatory governance of cultural heritage*
- International conference documentation in celebration of the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention (2012): Involving Communities in World Heritage Conservation – Concepts and Actions in Asia*
- Ismail, M. (thesis, 2013): *Involving the local community towards Cultural Heritage Management in Malaysia*
- Li, Y.; Hunter, C., (2015): *Community involvement for sustainable heritage tourism: a conceptual model; in: Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development, Vol. 5 Issue: 3, pp.248-262*
- Office of Environment and Heritage NSW (2015): National Parks and Wildlife Service: Community and Stakeholder Engagement – Procedural Guidelines*
- Op den Camp, J. (2011): *Community Involvement and Empowerment in World Heritage Cultural Sites; AAHM conference/APJTR paper*
- Osireditse Keitumetse, S. (2016): *Towards Sustainable Communities: Community-Based Cultural Heritage Resources Management (COBACHREM) Model; in: African Cultural Heritage Conservation and Management, pp. 89-111*
- OWHC Regional Secretariat Northwest Europe and North America (2016): “Heritage and Community Involvement; conference report Poullos, I. (2014): The past in the present: a living heritage approach – Meteora, Greece*
- Reggers, A. (thesis, 2013): *Communities, Co-management and world heritage: the case of Kokoda*
- Van Balen, K.; Vandesande, A. (eds., 2015): *Community involvement in heritage*
- Waterton, E.; Watson, St. (eds. 2011): *Heritage and community involvement: collaboration or contestation?*
- Wijesuriya, G; Court, S. (2015): *People-centred approaches to the conservation of cultural heritage: living heritage; ICCROM*



O V P M
O W H C
O C P M

Regional Secretariat
Northwest Europe and North America



Publisher

City of Regensburg
Planning and Building Division
World Heritage Coordination
OWHC Regional Secretariat
Northwest Europe and North America

D.-Martin-Luther-Str. 1
93047 Regensburg/Germany
Phone +49(0)941-507 4614
welterbe@regensburg.de
www.regensburg.de/welterbe

Editor

Monika Göttler, Matthias Ripp

Text

Nils Scheffler, Urban Expert
Matthias Ripp, OWHC Regional Coordinator
Monika Göttler, OWHC Regional Secretariat
Susanne Hauer, World Heritage Coordination Regensburg

Contributions

EUROCITIES, Cécile Houpert
COMUS, Hakan Demir/Philip Stein
OWHC member cities:

Amsterdam, Inez Weyermans
Bamberg, Patricia Alberth
Beemster, Janneke van Dijk
Berlin, Dr. Ramona Dornbusch
Philadelphia, Zabeth Teelucksingh and Nikia Brown
Québec, Julie Lemieux and Odile Roy
Quedlinburg, Katrin Kaltschmidt
Rauma, Jussi Telaranta and Laura Puolamäki
Regensburg, Monika Göttler
Stralsund, Steffi Behrendt
Warsaw, Anna Zasadzinska

Layout

www.grafikbuero-patrzek.de

Published: June 2017

This publication is the result of a cooperation of several partners and World Heritage Cities and the editors do not claim responsibility for any mistakes in spelling or grammar and websites that are indicated.

