



Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society

Meeting of the Faro Convention Community Council of Europe, Strasbourg Palais de l'Europe, room 14 29-30 November 2016

1. Context

As part of the second Faro Convention Action Plan, the Council of Europe organised a "Faro Community meeting" on 29 and 30 November 2016. The list of participants and programme appear in Appendix I and II respectively.

Participants listened to inspiring examples of citizen initiatives from all over Europe, providing much food for thought (see the power point presentations available on the website).

Discussions focused on the following issues.

2. Discussion points

Cooperation: *how can the Faro Convention help to build trust between elected representatives, institutions and civil society in previously conflictual contexts?*

- Illustrating the possible applications of the Faro Convention processes and their impact over time helps to convince people that the Faro Convention is not limited to a theoretical approach. The transfer of experiences (people to people) – whether it is from inhabitants to inhabitants, from elected representatives to elected representatives or institutions to institutions – is a good way to increase confidence in the importance of applying the Faro Convention.
- "Participatory budgets", increasingly adopted by towns, could be activities to initiate Faro processes. Faro processes call for a dual "bottom-up" and "top-down" approach, the Faro Convention being a framework Convention that invites all parties to progress within a given framework. One does not prevail over the other.
- The role of facilitator is central to the Faro processes, and anyone who is able to establish and maintain relationships between stakeholders can act as facilitators in the heritage communities.
- The experts and the Faro community could contribute to awareness raising and the training of stakeholders: local elected officials, public administrations and civil society.
- A Faro Convention process is based on the cooperation of four distinct levels of responsibility: Council of Europe / Ministry / Local authorities / civil society. "Civil society" can be interpreted in different ways, in view of the great diversity of member states of the Council of Europe.
- As local officials are elected, the Faro Convention processes have everything to gain by not being dependent on the will of one single local elected representative, as was the case in Venice. A Faro process could seek to diversify the elected representatives involved by associating several communities and / or the opposition.

Evaluation: *how can the Faro processes respond to the demand for evaluation inherent in any form of public action?*

- The use of the term "process" in the framework of the first Action Plan reflects the desire not to be part of an evaluation / indicators / defined parameters, but rather to promote a more flexible approach based on a common reference framework (appreciation vs. inspection).
- Appreciate the contribution of the Faro Convention process in respecting human rights, the rule of law and democracy, and more particularly the current priorities of the Council of Europe.
- Appreciate the level of implementation of the Faro Convention process from "key points" such as the Faro Convention criteria and thus valorize the importance of the work carried out (evolution of the process).
- Universities could be given greater opportunity to contribute to the evaluation of Faro Convention processes while clarifying linkages between the university, the Faro community or the heritage community.

Criteria and principles: *should the principles and criteria from the Marseilles Forum be updated, supplemented or modified by the experts and members of the Faro community?*

Reminder: the nine criteria and three principles came from the Marseilles Forum on the **social** value of heritage and in response to the priorities of the Council of Europe at the time.

- The crosscutting issues regarding democratic participation (co-operation), diversity and social cohesion (narratives) and quality of life/living environment (commons) with issues regarding processes (who?), procedures (how?) and products (what?). The sustainability of the Faro processes is not really taken into account in the current criteria which assess a "de facto" situation and not so much its evolution/stability. The term "criteria" could lead to the idea of evaluation and some kind of judgment without contextualization.
- A process of self-evaluation based on the Faro Convention criteria could be put in place when joining the Faro community and revisited on a regular basis by each member.

Economic model: *how to identify and promote new sustainable business models for the Faro processes?*

- The long-term inclusion of Faro Convention processes outside public funding alone remains fragile or difficult to implement due to lack of models, facilitators or examples to rely on. Strengthening ties with creative industries and the participatory economy could benefit the Faro Convention processes in finding new economic models adapted to their position. A Faro Lab on the "economic value" of heritage could be organised by the Faro Community and the Council of Europe.

Dissonant narrative: *how, while still respecting the diversity of interpretations, can we manage "free speech" within the framework of public action, which may sometimes be in contradiction with the values promoted by the Faro Convention?*

- "Dissonant" heritage", whether from totalitarian regimes such as Pilsen, Viscri, Forlì or from colonial times like in Marseilles, are sometimes sources of dissonant narratives like the nostalgia for these historical periods. Further examination of the relations between memories, history, narratives and daily life practices could be bases for some of the Faro convention workshops. The experience of the Council of Europe in terms of methodology for creating a dialogue in conflict zones could be utilized within the Faro Community (example of Caucasus and Balkans).

Migrants:

- For migrants, the right to culture is not necessarily seen as a priority because they are often "passing through" and have more urgent needs such as food, health or income. In addition, they often have their own networks which are not necessarily taken into account in local cultural policies. On the other hand, (particularly in most refugee cases), the only thing they

can bring with them is their dignity and heritage, which is a concern to the Faro Convention approach. It is more relevant to work with the second generation of migrants, i.e. their children. The Council of Europe has published a guide "Migrants and their descendants". The participation of migrants in heritage actions can be a powerful leverage for mobilisation because it gives them responsibilities in the context of public action.

Discrimination: *does the Faro Convention involve specific actions for some groups (migrants, Roma, young people, etc.) or is it a matter of reaching out to a public service open to as many people as possible and concerned about specific groups?*

- Care should be taken not to create new discrimination by focusing actions on specific groups and forgetting others, such as workers or the elderly.

3. Proposals

Workshop

- Workshop on "social contract" or "common goals" based on the experiences of the community members: Fontecchio – Borghi attivi, Viscri – social contract, Junik – Community consultation, Cervia – Albergo di comunità;
- Workshop on structured dialogue and decision-making processes to manage situations related to dissonant heritage based on the "structured dialogue" methodology developed in Cyprus;
- Workshop on the potential of the new collaborative economy for Faro processes from the "H2H Human to Human" project carried out by several members of the Faro community.

Good practices

- Test the new application of the Faro "**hospitality stories**" (Forlì),
- Continue experimenting with the new Faro "School of Hosts" application (already running in Forlì and Venice),
- Model and experiment with the new Faro good practices "Educational tools",
- Appreciate the potential of new applications: Interpretation Centres, the Taula Del Sénia experience in political cooperation, the "Borghi attivi" project on post-earthquake situations.

Promotion

- Consideration of "Faro Ambassadors", from the Faro community as well as other CoE initiatives including Cultural Routes, European Heritage Days to promote the Convention and the Strategy 21, particularly in light of the European Year 2018 of Cultural Heritage

Training

- Develop a "Faro Travel Agency" enabling people to people encounters between members of heritage communities (European project);
- Organise "summer camps" to mobilise the Faro community and a group of students on a specific problem.

Conclusions:

Faro Convention promotion:

- Testimonies from the field to document the progress before and during the Faro Convention process should be considered
- Work is necessary with the governments to map the initiatives and align themselves with the Faro Convention principles
- Connection with the CoE congress would be useful
- Examples in local languages would be encouraging for further attention
- Promotional messages should include the messages that
 - the Faro Convention is a way of approaching heritage
 - the Faro Convention Action Plan is an exercise in participatory democracy
 - an increased understanding of one's heritage allows self-emancipation and collective development

Faro Convention Network:

- Faro community at times creates confusion with heritage community, therefore could be referred as the Faro Convention Network
- Acknowledgement by European institutions is important for local initiatives
- Practice of democracy in communities help to learn how to work with (temporary) authorities as they are elected and assume the authority for a certain period of time.
- Sustained engagement of heritage communities and participatory approach is labour intensive and is a challenge, therefore heritage management also becomes challenging
- Introduction of a self-evaluation process should be explored
- Exchange between groups would be more efficient than the individuals participating in meetings as they would feel the support in their respective communities.

Faro Convention in Action:

- Faro Convention Labs would be useful to examine the relationship between heritage and other sectors and should focus on
 - Multiplicity and civil society engagement
 - Working with community members as a good empowering tool
 - Heritage education
 - Structured dialogue workshop
- Providing concrete examples is a powerful way to engage people
- Revisiting principles and criteria is needed as they should ensure sustained interest
- Ideas for 2018 - the European cultural heritage year should be explored
- A joint project among Faro Convention Network members would make the process more dynamic

Faro Convention Spotlights

- Communities in danger (e.g. abandoned areas due to earthquakes in Italy)
- Invasive development through tourism
- Migration

Faro Convention Research

- Increased involvement of academia and NGOs would be enriching

APPENDIX I

- Mr Hryhoriy ARSHYNOV** Ostroh, Ukraine - E-mail: garshinov@yahoo.com
- Mr Francesco CALZOLAIO** Director Lagunalonga Srl, Presidente associazione Venti di Cultura, membro ICOMOS, Faro Venezia, Europa Nostra
EIHC Committee
Cannaregio 986
I-30121 VENEZIA, Italy
E-mail: f.calzolaio@culturnet.net
- Ms Claudia CASTELLUCCI** Responsible for European Projects and International Relations, Municipality of Forlì
Via Giorgina Saffi, 18.
47121 Forlì, Italy
E-mail: claudia.castellucci@comune.forli.fc.it
- Ms Sabrina CIANCONE** Mayor of Fontecchio,
Via Contrada Murata 10
I-67020 FONTECCHIO, Italy
E-mail: sabrina.ciancone@gmail.com
- Ms Julie DE MUER** Hôtel du Nord, Bureau des guides du GR2013, Radio Grenouille,
Co-Opérative
5 impasse Fernand Henri
F-13016 MARSEILLE, France
E-mail : juliedemuer@gmail.com
- Ms Aintzane EGUILIOR MANCISIDOR** OEJ-JEP Bizkaia
Difusioa eta Komunikazioa
M^a Diaz de Haro, 11 – 1^o
48013 BILBAO, Spain
E-mail: aintzane.egilior@bizkaia.eus
- Ms Carolina FERNOLEND** Vice-President, Mihai Eminescu Trust
Strada Cojocarilor nr. 10
SIGHISOARA 545400, Romania
E-mail: cfernolend@mihaieminescutrust.org
- Ms Claire GIRAUD-LABALTE** Ambassador member of ENCATC (Réseau européen des politiques et du management culturels),
Chair of Understanding Heritage
40 rue de la Trémisnière
F-44300 NANTES, France
E-mail: lacledesarts@wanadoo.fr
- Mr Marios MICHAELIDES** Head of the Cyprus Academy of Public Administration
Klimentos 17 – 19
1473 NICOSIA, Cyprus
E-mail: mmichaelides@capa.mof.gov.cy

Mr Arif MUHARREMI Ahmet Koronica St.
PRISTINA, Kosovo¹
E-mail: arif.muharremi@gmail.com

Ms Daniela POGGIALI Dirigente Settore Cultura, Turismo, Servizi alla Persona e
Progetto Patrimonio, Comune di Cervia
Piazza G. Garibaldi 1
48015 CERVIA, Italy
E-mail poggialid@comunecervia.it

Ms Ana SCHOEBEL Instituto del Patrimonio Cultural de España, Ministerio de
Educación, Cultura y Deporte
c/Greco, 4
ES-28040 MADRID, Spain
E-mail: ana.schoebel@mecd.es

Mr Clément SIMONNEAU Chargé d'étude en ingénierie touristique, Co-gérant de la
coopérative d'hospitalité H2H
37 rue de la Roche
86000 POITIERS, France
E-mail: ekitour.conseil@gmail.com

Ms Adéla ŠMAUSOVA Majak Plzen / Hidden Pilsen
Alej Svobody 27
323 00 PLZEN, Czech Republic
E-mail: adelasmausova@email.cz

Mr Ugo TOIĆ OTRA
Ulica Creskog statuta 15
51557 CRES, Croatia
E-mail: ugo@pplr-otokres.info

Mr Nikolaus WOSTRY Filmarchiv Austria
Parkweg 89
2361 LAXENBURG, Austria
E-mail: n.wostry@filmarchiv.at

Observers:

Ms Giorgia CECCHI Coordinator Ecomuseo del Sale e del Mare
CERVIA, Italy
E-mail: cecchig@comunecervia.it

Ms Elisa GIOVANNETTI President of the ATRIUM Association
FORLI, Italy

Ms Sabrina ZOPPOLI Deputy Mayor of Fontecchio
Contrada Murata
67020 FONTECCHIO L'AQUILA, Italy
E-mail: sabrina.zoppoli@gmail.com

Council of Europe Faro Lead Expert

Mr Prosper WANNER Santa Croce 805
I-30135 VENEZIA, Italy
E-mail: pwplace@nnx.com

¹ "All reference to Kosovo, whether to the territory, institutions or population, in this text shall be understood in full compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo"

Council of Europe Observer

Ms Jelena MOCEVIC

Project Manager European Heritage Days

E-mail: jelena.mocevic@gmail.com

Council of Europe Secretariat

Democratic Initiatives Department

Mr Eladio FERNANDEZ GALIANO

Head of Department

E-mail: Eladio.fernandez-galiano@coe.int

Democratic Institutions and Governance Department / Managing Diversity Division

Mr Gianluca SILVESTRINI

Head of Division

E-mail: gianluca.silvestrini@coe.int

Mr Hakan DEMIR

Programme Manager

E-mail: hakan.demir@coe.int

Ms Alison HELM

Programme Co-ordinator

E-mail: alison.helm@coe.int

Ms Claudine NONNENMACHER-CANCEMI

Secretariat

E-Mail: claudine.nonnenmacher@coe.int

APPENDIX II

Programme

Tuesday, 29 November

- 09.00 Opening of the meeting; adoption of the agenda
- 09.15 Updates on the Faro Community
- 12.45 Lunch
- 14.30 Faro Community activities 2016
- 15.30 Lessons learned and reflections from 2016 – revisit principles and criteria
Facilitated discussion
- 17.00 Conclusions for the day

Wednesday, 30 November

- 09.00 Good practices, facilitators and practitioners
Identified good practices, procedure to become Faro good practice, interested countries to test and report, adoption of good practices and practitioners
- 11.30 Plan of Action 2017
Programme
Visibility
Communication – Facebook, Asana
- 12.30 Addressing the questions
- 13.00 End of the meeting