

40th SESSION
Second part

Report
 CG(2021)40-22
 17 May 2021

Culture without borders: Cultural heritage management for local and regional development

Current Affairs Committee

Rapporteurs:¹ Eirini DOUROU, Greece (R, SOC) and Barbara TOCE, Italy (L, SOC)

Resolution 474 (2021)	2
Recommendation 463 (2021)	5
Explanatory memorandum	7

Summary

The report focuses on understanding cultural heritage as both tangible heritage objects and intangible practices, knowledge and experiences, emphasising its importance as a socio-economic catalyser and as a powerful tool for sustainable development, urban regeneration and tourism. It underlines the essential role that local and regional authorities play in promoting and safeguarding cultural heritage as custodians of cultural diversity and how they can use it to improve social cohesion and intercultural dialogue, to reinforce participatory governance and engage with disconnected communities.

The Congress calls on local and regional authorities to invest, support and promote cultural heritage, integrating it in related policies, programmes and actions and to develop both quantitative and qualitative indicators to measure its impact in order to ensure its sustainability in the long term. It invites cities and regions to make use of cultural heritage management to develop remote and peripheral areas as a means for achieving territorial justice and to acknowledge cities as main players of cultural diplomacy.

The Congress recommends the governments of member States to promote cultural tourism as a means to support the development of regions and urban areas, adopting at the same time a “responsible tourism” approach. It invites them to support and reinforce major European initiatives on cultural heritage financially. Finally, it calls on all member States that have not yet done so, to sign and ratify the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society of the Council of Europe (the “Faro Convention”) and the European Landscape Convention.

1 L: Chamber of Local Authorities / R: Chamber of Regions
 EPP/CCE: European People’s Party Group in the Congress
 SOC/G/PD: Socialist, Greens and Progressive Democrats Group
 ILDG: Independent and Liberal Democrat Group
 ECR: European Conservatives and Reformists Group
 NR: Members not belonging to a political group of the Congress

RESOLUTION 474 (2021)²

1. Cultural heritage includes assets inherited from past generations which people identify with and value as an expression of their own knowledge and traditions and as a legacy that enhances cultural identity. It is subject to continuous change and transformation while also aiming to retain the cultural significance of what exists.

2. As recognised by the UNESCO Conventions on the [Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage \(1972\)](#) and on the [Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage \(2003\)](#), it has a double character which consists of tangible and intangible assets. The first refer to artefacts produced, maintained and transmitted intergenerationally in a society and the second, to practices, expressions, knowledge and skills that communities recognise as part of their cultural heritage. As highlighted by the UNESCO [Convention on the protection and promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions \(2005\)](#), cultural heritage also has an economic dimension.

3. The Council of Europe (“the CoE”) takes note of the great value of cultural heritage as a means to promote diversity and dialogue across its member States. By encouraging opportunities to access heritage, it aims at fostering a sense of identity, collective memory and mutual understanding within and between communities. In the last decades, the CoE has produced landmark documents on the subject, such as The European Landscape Convention [CETS No. 176\(2000\)](#) which promotes the protection, management and planning of the landscapes, and The Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society of the Council of Europe (also known as the “Faro Convention”) [CETS No. 199\(2005\)](#) which emphasizes the important aspects of heritage as they relate to human rights and democracy.

4. The Parliamentary Assembly (“the PACE”) and the Committee of Ministers, have adopted several recommendations to member States related to cultural heritage, respectively [Recommendation 2149 \(2019\)](#) on “The value of cultural heritage in a democratic society”, and [Recommendation CM/Rec\(2017\)1](#) on the “European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st century”.

5. Building on the above, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe (“the Congress”), has contributed to the subject, adopting resolutions, namely [Resolution 202\(2005\)](#) on “Intercultural and inter-faith dialogue: initiatives and responsibilities of local authorities” and [Resolution 379\(2015\)](#) on “Jewish cemeteries: the responsibility of local authorities” concerning local and regional authorities’ role in the protection, preservation, enhancement, management and maintenance of burial sites as part of local history.

6. Local and regional authorities have a major role in determining how the past shapes the present and the future of their cities and regions. Their policies and actions related to cultural heritage, engaging with diverse communities within and across borders, reconciling conflicting narratives, boosting the economic strength of their territories to achieve higher living standards, bringing different stakeholders together, will contribute to improving sustainable economic development, social inclusion and participatory governance.

7. In its priorities for 2017-2020, the Congress reiterated its intention to promote intercultural dialogue and preserve cultural and architectural heritage at the local and regional level as a means to implement the United Nations 2030 Agenda and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Targets 8. 9 and 12.b of the Agenda refer to the need to devise and implement policies to promote sustainable tourism, including through local culture and products, and to the need to develop suitable monitoring tools in this area. Target 11.4 highlights the need to strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage.

8. In light of the above,

a. considering that cultural heritage creation, preservation and promotion is part of local and regional competences and that local communities are bearers of heritage values as custodians of the survival of cultural diversity, as recognised by the above-mentioned conventions;

² Discussed and adopted by the Congress on 17 June 2021, 3rd sitting (see Document CG(2021)40-22, explanatory memorandum), rapporteurs: Eirini DOUROU, Greece (R, SOC/G/PD) and Barbara TOCE, Italy (L, SOC/G/PD).

b. taking into account the advent of digital technology, the increasing environmental and climate-related risks and the massive changes to social life brought about by urbanisation, globalisation and hypermobility which have an impact on how cultural heritage is perceived and dealt with;

c. cognizant of the need to adapt and transform cultural heritage policies in order to assist economic and sustainable development, urban regeneration and tourism in European cities and regions and to promote intercultural dialogue, aiming for social cohesion by involving local citizens and improving cooperation with disconnected communities;

d. mindful of the responsibility that falls on local and regional authorities to take measures in terms of acquiring information and improving their knowledge-base, developing policies, taking action and networking to promote and preserve cultural heritage, highlighting emerging issues (such as climate change, “over-tourism” or public health emergencies) for which it is urgent to produce new tools and instruments or more actively implement policies on the basis of existing studies;

e. mindful also that in order to overcome the current European identity crisis, action needs to be taken on the basis of pluralist and diversified cultural heritage management tools, created and deployed by local and regional governments in cooperation with professionals and citizens;

f. recognising that youth engagement is important in protecting and safeguarding cultural heritage and promoting cultural diversity as a vital element of preventing violent extremism and that young people are powerful peace-builders;

g. acknowledging that a change of paradigm is needed which addresses the lack of bottom-up and inclusive governance schemes, inequalities and territorial differences between regions and city areas, the lack of data and indicators beyond strict economic considerations and the lack of efficient tools for the preservation of the intangible aspects of urban or rural landscapes;

9. the Congress calls on local and regional authorities of its member States to:

a. promote an understanding of cultural heritage as an all-inclusive concept, bringing together tangible heritage objects as defined by the public authorities and intangible practices, knowledge, skills and experiences lived in communities;

b. continue to invest, support and promote cultural heritage, recognising it as an economic and social catalyser and as a powerful tool for the sustainable development of society as a whole, keeping in mind that cultural heritage management must be guided by the basic principles of local democracy, aiming for inclusion, diversity and respect for fundamental rights and that social inclusion harnesses our diversity as a fuel for small business formation, creativity and innovation;

c. promote sustainable cultural tourism given its beneficial nature from an economic point of view to contribute to the development of European regions and urban areas while at the same time adopting a “responsible tourism” approach, based on lessons learned from cities suffering under “over-tourism” and in light of the challenges and changes brought on by the impact of crisis situations (climate change, refugees and migrants, COVID-19) in all localities, but particularly in urban areas;

d. adopt and implement cultural heritage policies by integrating the study, care, protection and proper use of heritage in all related policies, programmes and actions such as urban planning, public spaces and educational programmes, monitoring their sustainability and connection to existing projects;

e. develop both quantitative and qualitative indicators to measure the impact of cultural heritage that can showcase its cross-sectorial impact at regional and local governance level, in order to raise awareness of the benefits that investment in cultural heritage can bring across a wide range of policy areas;

f. reinforce participatory governance as well as the structured and systematic inclusion of all stakeholders and civil society, including migrant and marginalised or disconnected populations, in developing strategies and policies for cultural heritage, in close co-operation with the work carried out by public agencies and professionals at local and regional level, providing them with training and research tools and focusing on local capacity building for cultural operators and artists;

g. raise young people's awareness of the importance of heritage diversity, its conservation, enhancement and transmission, giving them a chance to voice their concerns and to become involved in the protection and promotion of the common cultural and natural heritage, supporting their engagement and participation, and co-creating with them projects that will contribute to exchanges and sustainable local and regional development;

h. acknowledge cities as main players of cultural diplomacy, supporting and fostering the development of networks of diaspora/migrant communities on cultural heritage cooperation and contribute thereby to realising the potential of cities as international cultural actors;

i. reinvent public spaces as platforms for cultural heritage, favouring their communal function to counteract the increasing dominance of their commercial function, promoting them as platforms for collective expression, democratic discourse and problem solving;

j. rethink contested heritages in Europe, by encouraging public debate, welcoming different historical perspectives and reconstructing the discourse around these issues in order to help to decrease conflict escalation;

k. make effective use of cultural heritage management at local and regional level to develop remote and peripheral areas as a means for achieving territorial justice, to save remote areas from the negative spiral of deindustrialisation, desertification and marginalisation;

l. develop new city networking initiatives within Europe and expand the current European Capital of Culture programme to other countries to encourage sharing of cultural influences and bridging cultural heritage programmes;

m. create university networks on European cultural heritage, given that they work closely with local and regional authorities and are well connected with the local communities, and are important players for the implementation of projects and initiatives aiming to use heritage as a tool for promoting and sharing the core values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law;

n. join the "Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe" networks crossing their territories promoting local cultural heritage, sustainable cultural tourism and community participation in a pan-European perspective.

RECOMMENDATION 463 (2021)³

1. Cultural heritage includes assets inherited from past generations which people identify with and value as an expression of their own knowledge and traditions and as a legacy that enhances cultural identity. It is subject to continuous change and transformation while also aiming to retain the cultural significance of what exists.
2. As recognised by the UNESCO Conventions on the [Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage \(1972\)](#) and on the [Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage \(2003\)](#), it has a double character which consists of tangible and intangible assets. The first refer to artefacts produced, maintained and transmitted intergenerationally in a society and the second, to practices, expressions, knowledge and skills that communities recognise as part of their cultural heritage. As highlighted by the UNESCO [Convention on the protection and promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions \(2005\)](#), cultural heritage also has an economic dimension.
3. The Council of Europe (“the CoE”) takes note of the great value of cultural heritage as a means to promote diversity and dialogue across its member States. By encouraging opportunities to access heritage, it aims at fostering a sense of identity, collective memory and mutual understanding within and between communities. In the last decades, the CoE has produced landmark documents on the subject, such as The European Landscape Convention [CETS No. 176\(2000\)](#) which promotes the protection, management and planning of the landscapes, and The Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society of the Council of Europe (also known as the “Faro Convention”) [CETS No. 199\(2005\)](#) which emphasizes the important aspects of heritage as they relate to human rights and democracy.
4. The Parliamentary Assembly (“the PACE”) and the Committee of Ministers, have adopted several Recommendations to member States related to cultural heritage, respectively [Recommendation 2149 \(2019\)](#) on “The value of cultural heritage in a democratic society”, and [Recommendation CM/Rec\(2017\)1](#) on the “European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st century”.
5. Building on the above, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe (“the Congress”), has contributed to the subject, adopting resolutions, namely [Resolution 202\(2005\)](#) on “Intercultural and inter-faith dialogue: initiatives and responsibilities of local authorities” and [Resolution 379\(2015\)](#) on “Jewish cemeteries: the responsibility of local authorities” concerning local and regional authorities’ role in the protection, preservation, enhancement, management and maintenance of burial sites as part of local history.
6. In its priorities for 2017-2020, the Congress reiterated its intention to promote intercultural dialogue and preserve cultural and architectural heritage at the local and regional level as a means to implement the United Nations 2030 Agenda and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Targets 8. 9 and 12.b of the Agenda refer to the need to devise and implement policies to promote sustainable tourism, including through local culture and products, and to the need to develop suitable monitoring tools in this area. Target 11.4 highlights the need to strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage.
7. New digital technologies, the increasing environmental and climate-related risks and the massive changes to social life brought about by urbanisation, “over-tourism”, globalisation and hypermobility have an impact how cultural heritage is perceived and necessitate the production of new tools and instruments to implement appropriate policies at all levels of government.
8. They also require cultural heritage policies to be adapted and transformed in order to assist economic and sustainable development and tourism in European cities and regions and to promote intercultural dialogue, aiming for social cohesion. A change of paradigm is needed which addresses the lack of bottom-up and inclusive governance schemes, inequalities and territorial differences between regions and city areas, the lack of data and indicators beyond strict economic considerations and the lack of efficient tools for the preservation of the intangible aspects of urban or rural landscapes.

³ See footnote 2.

9. In light of the above, the Congress calls on Council of Europe member States to:

a. promote an understanding of cultural heritage as an all-inclusive concept, bringing together tangible heritage objects as defined by the official authorities and intangible practices, knowledge, skills and experiences lived in communities;

b. continue to invest, support and promote cultural heritage, recognising it as an economic and social catalyser and a powerful tool for the sustainable development of society as a whole, acknowledging its potential for anchoring a European identity in concrete territorial landscapes, and as a means for reconciliation of diverging historical narratives;

c. support and provide guidelines to local and regional authorities for developing participatory governance as a means to achieve the structured and systematic inclusion of all stakeholders and civil society in developing strategies and policies for cultural heritage, including migrant populations and marginalised or disconnected communities, keeping in mind that cultural heritage management must be guided by the basic principles of local democracy, aiming for inclusion, diversity and respect for fundamental rights;

d. adopt and implement cultural heritage policies by integrating the care, protection and proper use of heritage in all related programmes and actions, with particular emphasis on educational programmes and school curricula, raising awareness among children and young people on cultural heritage as a medium linking the past and the future, recognising that heritage is a dynamic process and involving local and regional authorities in shaping and implementing these policies;

e. promote cultural tourism, recognising its beneficial nature from an economic point of view, in order to support the development of regions and urban areas, adopting at the same time a “responsible tourism” approach, based on lessons learned from cities suffering under “over-tourism” and in light of the challenges and changes brought on by the impact of crisis situations (climate change, refugees and migrants, COVID-19), particularly in urban areas;

f. mobilise resources (academic and administrative) and cooperate with local and regional authorities to develop both quantitative and qualitative indicators to measure the impact of cultural heritage that can showcase its cross-sectorial impact at all levels of governance and raise awareness of the benefits that investment in cultural heritage can bring across a wide range of policy areas;

g. support and reinforce major European initiatives on cultural heritage financially, developing a good governance framework followed with appropriate indicators.

10. The Congress invites all member States that have not yet done so, to sign and ratify the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society of the Council of Europe (also known as the “Faro Convention”) and the European Landscape Convention.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM⁴

1. INTRODUCTION

1. Cultural heritage is a broad concept that includes all assets, inherited from past generations, which people identify with and value as an expression of their own knowledge and traditions and as a legacy that enhances cultural identity. It aims to retain the cultural significance of what exists, but it is also subject to continuous change and transformation.

2. Since its establishment in 1949, the Council of Europe has been aware of the importance of cultural heritage for achieving a greater unity among Europeans. Its commitment in this field has led to the conceptualisation of cultural heritage and the formulation of an array of Conventions designed to its protection, enhancement and promotion.

3. The European Cultural Convention, adopted in 1954, is the oldest and best known of these mechanisms. Along with the evolution of the concept of cultural heritage, this unique and pioneer convention was complemented over time with several legal instruments specialising in different forms of heritage: the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada, 1985), the [European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage](#) of Europe (Valletta, 1992), the European Convention for the Protection of the Audio-visual Heritage (Strasbourg, 2001) and the Convention on Offences relating to Cultural Property (Nicosia, 2017), among others.

4. UNESCO has also manifested its concerns about cultural heritage protection by adopting the Conventions on the [Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage \(1972\)](#) and on the [Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage \(2003\)](#). [These two legal instruments](#) recognise the double character of cultural heritage, emphasise the interdependence between its intangible and tangible nature and acknowledge the significant role communities play as bearers of heritage. Moreover, with the adoption of its [Convention on the protection and promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions \(2005\)](#), UNESCO has highlighted the economic dimension of cultural expression and launched the Culture for Sustainable Urban Development Initiative.

5. In line with the above, the Council of Europe (CoE) recognises the great value of cultural heritage as a means to promote diversity and dialogue across its member States. By encouraging opportunities to access heritage, it aims at fostering a sense of identity, collective memory and mutual understanding within and between communities. In the last decades, the Council of Europe has produced some landmark documents and programmes on the subject, such as The European Landscape Convention [CETS No. 176\(2000\)](#), the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society of the Council of Europe (also known as the “Faro Convention”) [CETS No. 199\(2005\)](#) and established the Enlarged Partial Agreement on Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe ([CM/Res\(2013\)66](#)).

6. The Parliamentary Assembly (PACE) and the Committee of Ministers, have adopted several Recommendations to member States related to cultural heritage, respectively [Recommendation 2149 \(2019\)](#) on “The value of cultural heritage in a democratic society”, and [Recommendation CM/Rec\(2017\)1](#) on the “European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st century”.

7. Building on the above, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe (“the Congress”), has contributed to the subject over the years, adopting namely the [European Urban Charter II: Manifesto for a New Urbanity](#), [Resolution 202\(2005\)](#) on “Intercultural and inter-faith dialogue: initiatives and responsibilities of local authorities” and [Resolution 379\(2015\)](#) on “Jewish cemeteries: the responsibility of Local Authorities” concerning local and regional authorities’ role in the protection, preservation, enhancement, management and maintenance of burial sites as part of local history.

8. In its priorities for 2017-2020, the Congress reiterated its intention to promote intercultural dialogue and preserve cultural and architectural heritage at the local and regional level as a means to implement the United Nations 2030 Agenda and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

⁴ This explanatory memorandum is based on the document prepared by the Council of Europe consultant Maria GRAVARI-BARBAS, Director of EIREST (Equipe Interdisciplinaire de Recherches Sur le Tourisme), University of Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne. The written contribution is available from the Secretariat upon request.

9. Although none of the 17 SDGs focuses exclusively on culture, SDGs No. 8 "Decent Work and Economic Growth", No. 11 "Sustainable Cities" and no. 12 "Responsible Consumption and Production" explicitly refer to the different cultural aspects covered in this report: Targets 8.9 and 12.b refer to the need to devise and implement policies to promote sustainable tourism, including through local culture and products, and to the need to develop suitable monitoring tools in this area. Target 11.4 highlights the need to strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage.⁵

10. Cities and regions are now coping with the COVID-19 pandemic, an unprecedented event that has severely impacted their economic, cultural and social development. In this regard, a wake-up call for the international community to reinvest in international cooperation, dialogue and sense of belonging is needed. Ernesto Ottone, Assistant UNESCO Director-General for Culture, has reminded all that "Now, more than ever, people need culture. Culture makes us resilient. It gives us hope. It reminds us that we are not alone".⁶

11. Regrettably, cultural heritage is among the sectors that have been hit severely by the crisis; the closure of heritage sites, museums and other cultural institutions is jeopardising funding for artists and the creative industries as well as funding for the conservation of these sites and culture related professions. COVID-19 has also put many intangible cultural heritage practices, including rituals and ceremonies, on hold, impacting communities everywhere; it has cost many jobs across the globe.

12. The current report has been prepared with the objective to examine the transformation of cultural heritage policies in order to assist economic and sustainable development in European cities and regions and to promote intercultural dialogue and sustainable tourism, aiming for social cohesion by involving local citizens and improving cooperation with disconnected communities. It also calls on public authorities to continue to invest, support and promote cultural heritage and cultural routes, recognising it as a social and economic catalyser and as a powerful tool for the sustainable development of society as a whole.

2. CULTURAL HERITAGE: WHAT DOES THE CONCEPT COVER TODAY?

13. In the last decades of the 20th century, the notion of cultural heritage went through a shift by moving from an object-centred approach to a subject-centred one, focusing less on the heritage object itself and more on its intangible social and relational potential. It has moved from objects to functions and has come to be understood more as an agent and a process rather than isolated, selected objects, cutting across social, cultural and environmental issues.⁷

14. The definition of heritage included in the Faro Convention (Article 2) can serve as reference for the new, more subjective valuation of heritage: "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".

15. This shift on the notion of cultural heritage, from a static approach - isolated monuments and sites – to a dynamic and participatory one – such as cultural routes – entails the need for new integrated and holistic heritage management strategies. It has changed the role heritage plays in cultural, social and economic fields dramatically, bringing about an understanding that the underlying issues and challenges require new theoretical, inter-disciplinary and operational approaches.⁸

5 UCLG, *Culture in the Sustainable Development Goals: A Guide for Local Action*, May 2018, p.3, available at https://www.uclg.org/sites/default/files/culture_in_the_sdgs.pdf

6 UNESCO supports culture and heritage during COVID-19 shutdown, 2020 <https://en.unesco.org/news/unesco-supports-culture-and-heritage-during-covid-19-shutdown>

7 Gravari-Barbas, *Nouveaux défi pour le patrimoine culturel, Atelier de réflexion prospective (ARP)*, Agence Nationale pour la Recherche. <https://anr.fr/fileadmin/documents/2014/ARP-PACT-Etat-de-l-art.pdf>

8 Gravari-Barbas *et al*, *New Challenges for Cultural Heritage*, 2014. https://www.pantheon-sorbonne.fr/fileadmin/Colloques_IREST/ARP_Synth%C3%A8se_mise_en_page_anglais.pdf

16. Several factors of change jointly influence the way cultural heritage is conceived and managed in contemporary societies:

- *Globalisation* is the first of these. It not only brings national heritage to the world stage, but also invites the world to take part in its “social production”. Historically, the process through which objects, places and practices are turned into cultural heritage (“heritagisation”) has been a nation-oriented phenomenon. Today, it increasingly interacts with the new phase of globalisation and with the construction of plural territories and identities, on different scales.

- *Societal changes* modify the relationship with heritage: The ageing of the population leads to intergenerational gaps in the way people approach and conceive of heritage and calls into question the continuation of certain heritage practices. The blending (or “hybridization”) of lifestyles and practices (creating hypermobility, multiple associative and social ties and cultural affiliations, multi-territoriality, urbanisation, multi-nuclear families, the blurring of genders) impacts the ways we position ourselves in the world and influences our attachment to cultural heritage.

- *Environmental and climate-related risks*, both as “objective” and “reflective” phenomena, change people’s relationship to heritage and its management models. Sustainability becomes the primary approach towards heritage, leading to a new predominance of the ethical over the aesthetic, and contributes to merge heritage considerations with a generalized concern about living environment and well-being. UNESCO’s [“Policy document on the impacts of climate change on World Heritage properties”](#)⁹ discusses the threats posed to both natural and cultural World Heritage properties of outstanding universal value and advocates the adoption of precautionary measures to anticipate, prevent or minimise the causes of climate change and mitigate its adverse effects. It recommends the development of best practices in vulnerability assessments, adaptation strategies, mitigation opportunities, and pilot projects.

- *Micro and macro-economic changes*. Structural changes of late capitalism accelerate the production of vacant spaces (industrial buildings, army barracks, ports...) and their possible transformation into heritage.

- *Digital technology* shakes up the way we position ourselves in the world as regards the “here” and the “elsewhere”, the present and the past.

- *Cross-cutting relations of cultural heritage with other sectors*: The conjunction of cultural heritage transformations and other social processes, such as local development, metropolisation, migrations and mobilities, changes heritage from what was once a clearly defined sector into a phenomenon cutting across all parts of social activity.

2.1 A new heritage regime

17. The above-mentioned factors of change all have an impact on the notion of heritage, creating a “new heritage regime” characterising contemporary society.

18. To sum up, this new heritage regime forms a system with the new phase of globalisation and calls into question the heritage “stock” of a nation or of a defined social group and its inalienability.

19. Its main characteristics are:

- an all-inclusive nature uniting the tangible and intangible assets,
- the accent on its utility to the society
- a pragmatic acceptance of a shift from the heritage object *per se* towards its intangible potential (social, relational, economic, etc.),
- a constant weakening and re-strengthening of the ties between culture and place (in anthropology this is described as de-territorialisation and re-territorialisation),
- being transactional (civil society organisations at the neighbourhood level manage to identify agreements that offer, in whole or in part, a horizon for resolving tensions and problems experienced locally)¹⁰,

⁹ <https://whc.unesco.org/document/10046>

¹⁰ See for example the paper of Sénécal, G., Cloutier, G. & Herjean, P. (2008): *Le quartier comme espace transactionnel : l'expérience des Tables de concertation de quartier à Montréal*. Cahiers de géographie du Québec, 52 (146), 191–214.

- being performative (certain spaces and objects can acquire a heritage character through the action of the inhabitants and thus constitute their heritage. This heritage is made up of the heritage objects as defined by the official authorities, but also of those practices and experiences lived in the urban space, the sensitive relations felt in this same space, known knowledge and representations built in more or less ordinary places).

This leads to a remarkable shift in heritage discourse in contemporary policies, in which the value of cultural heritage is argued as a significant social and economic impact on society.

20. The attributes of this new heritage regime are:

- i. *Blurring of heritage categories*: Specific heritage categories have been defined in major conventions such as the Council of Europe European Cultural Convention (1954), the UNESCO Convention on World Heritage (1972) or the UNESCO Convention on Intangible Heritage (2003). However, cultural heritage is increasingly seen as a transversal issue. This goes beyond its tangible and intangible aspects to also include natural and cultural heritage, since it is becoming more and more difficult to justify the construction of too rigid categories.
- ii. *More “hands on” heritage practices*: Heritage becomes part of the social contract. There is a shift of perspective from heritage as an object towards the relationship established with the object, such as in the Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe programme (CM/Res(2013)66) and the European Heritage Days, a joint programme between the Council of Europe and the European Commission.
- iii. *New heritage producers*: The increasing number of heritage objects and the acceleration of heritage-making are considered as signs of a change in the heritage system, characterised by new heritage producers, values, functions, meanings and heritage scales (ranging from the local and national to the international).
- iv. *Heritage values are constantly and dynamically reinterpreted*: Heritage conservation is dynamic, directed towards increased sustained use defined by both change and continuity. Heritage is constantly being reinterpreted by different communities, which have their own ways of understanding and managing heritage, as well as implementing the principles of the Faro Convention to their benefit. These different perspectives and narratives are enriching the notion of heritage and can play a significant role in reconciliation of different communities.
- v. *Heritage has a regulatory function* going far beyond strict conservation of heritage artefacts to ensure the more holistic conservation of contemporary landscapes.

2.2 Cultural heritage as a source of democracy and sustainability

21. The new heritage regime brings cultural heritage to the very centre of current social, economic and cultural considerations much more than it used to be in the past. Cultural heritage can be a means to achieve sustainable goals, to achieve social justice and to guarantee empowerment:

- i. *Plurality and complexity in heritage production*: The desire of individuals and societies for heritage is fed by an ever-growing number of different actors. The continuous expansion of heritage leads to a re-examination and questioning of the hierarchies; heritage stakeholders at different levels (policy makers, heritage practitioners and local communities, the academic world) contribute together to the dynamic production of cultural heritage, creating hereby the possibility of making it a source of democracy and well-being.¹¹
- ii. *Heritage, a key element for regions*: Actors at various territorial levels are referring more and more to heritage in the construction, affirmation, and even the assertion of the “character” of

¹¹Grossi, Sacco et al, *The Impact of Culture on the Subjective Wellbeing*, 2011; Cicerchia A., 2016, *Culture and Wellbeing: Theory, Methodology and Other Challenges: An Itinerary*. <https://cultureactioneurope.org/advocacy/culture-and-wellbeing-theory-methodology-and-other-challenges-an-itinerary/>

their region. Heritage thus becomes a key notion in the construction of a shared identity, from the local to the *international level*.

- iii. *Heritage as a means for achieving sustainability, well-being and resilience*: Heritage acts as an active principle of sustainable development (The UN 2030 Agenda recognises culture as a driver of sustainable development). It plays an important role in the mediation between the a priori *conflictual* concepts of conservation which might give rise to situations where differing opinions over conservation objectives clash and one set of interests are served at the expense of another. The proper management of cultural heritage can contribute to a more inclusive society by facilitating a closer integration of the economic and social values it represents.

3. THE LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

22. Several influential conventions confirm the recent semantic evolution of cultural heritage. A considerable “grey literature” has been published (in particular, reports from CoE, UE, UNESCO, OCDE...) and an innumerable number of research papers offer a solid basis for further action. This section aims at critically analysing the main documents of reference on cultural heritage management as a tool for local and regional development in connection with the national, European and international scales.

3.1 European heritage: conventions and adopted texts

23. The change of heritage regime is reflected in Council of Europe, European and UNESCO treaties and conventions. They offer a conceptual and political canvass and alternative instrumental norms for European heritage, in comparison to international heritage conventions such as those developed by UNESCO, in particular, the UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972). This document is based on the concept of “Universal Outstanding Value” (OUV), and has undergone several considerable re-conceptualisations since the 1990s and the launching of the so-called “Global Strategy” (introduction of the concept of “cultural landscapes”, introduction of a 5th “C”¹² for Communities, enlargement of the Western-oriented concept of “authenticity”). Several voices challenge universality and bring-in the concept of “pluriversity”,¹³ contesting the universalist position to heritage.

24. The European Landscape Convention of the Council of Europe (2000, “ELC”), ratified by 40 member States in 2020, is remarkable, *inter alia*, for offering a new conceptual bridge between society and nature. The ELC is revolutionary in the way it has put ‘ordinary’ as well as ‘special’ landscapes onto government agendas throughout Europe. Shifting from the idea of “outstanding” landscapes, it potentially covers the entire territory. It innovates also because it puts people at the heart of landscape policy. The “landscape quality objectives” it develops express the aspirations of the public with regard to the landscape features of their surroundings. Considering that landscape is central to the balance between preserving nature on the one hand and cultural heritage as a reflection of European identity and diversity on the other, it encourages the public to take an active part in landscape management and planning, and to feel responsible for what happens to the landscape. “No longer the preserve of experts, landscape is now a policy area in its own right”¹⁴.

25. A specific provision of the ELC covers trans-frontier landscapes. Territory is seen as an entity that is remarkable for the character of its multiple heritage independently from borders. Article 9 of the ELC encourages Parties to engage in trans-frontier co-operation at local and regional levels in order to identify, evaluate, protect, manage and plan landscapes which straddle borders. Parties are asked to rely, as far as possible, on local and regional authorities¹⁵. The Landscape Award established by the Convention, awarded to a local or regional authority (in one country or on a trans-frontier basis) or to a

¹²The 5 “C”s are : Credibility of the World Heritage List; Conservation of World Heritage Properties; Capacity-building in States Parties; Public awareness, involvement and support for World Heritage through Communication; Community involvement.

¹³Salazar, *The Double Bind of World Heritage Tourism, in The Significance of World Heritage: Origins, Management, Consequences The Future of the World Heritage Convention in a Nordic Perspective*, Papers Presented at Two Conferences in Falun (Sweden) 2010 and in Vasa (Finland) 2011, 274-271, 2013(<https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:623256/FULLTEXT01.pdf>)

¹⁴ <https://www.coe.int/en/web/landscape/the-european-landscape-convention>

¹⁵ Bold J., Pickard R., (eds), 2018, *An Integrated Approach to Cultural Heritage*, The Council of Europe’s Technical Co-operation and Consultancy Programme, Council of Europe, Strasbourg

non-governmental organisation is meant to encourage the sustainable protection, management and planning of landscapes¹⁶.

26. The Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society of the Council of Europe (aka Faro Convention, 2005)¹⁷, ratified by 19 Member States and signed by 6 in 2020, introduces a conceptual, philosophical and ethical turn towards democratic and human values by anchoring heritage rights, cultural rights and human rights at the centre of a renewed understanding of cultural heritage. Communities' rights to cultural heritage are perceived as inherent in the right to participate in cultural life, as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

27. The Faro convention concerns "all forms of cultural heritage in Europe which together constitute a shared source of remembrance, understanding, identity, cohesion and creativity" as well as "the ideals, principles and values, derived from the experience gained through progress and past conflicts, which foster the development of a peaceful and stable society, founded on respect for human rights, democracy and the rule of law".

28. The Recommendation CM/Rec(2017)1 on the "[European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st century](#)" is another CoE tool adopted by the CM that can be inspirational in the present case. It is largely based on Faro Convention principles and suggests ideas on how to address specific issues while collecting good practices illustrating such suggestions.

29. Recent European treaties and conventions which provide a critical discussion and go beyond distinguishing between different types of heritage (tangible versus intangible, natural versus cultural) are community centred. They align in this sense with the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) which also emphasises the interdependence between intangible and tangible heritage, and the significant role communities play as bearers of heritage. Communities have a central role to the 2003 Convention and many participatory ways of implementing the Convention were developed as an answer to the challenges it formulated vis-à-vis heritage communities. One noteworthy document emanating from the Summit of the Heads of State and Government of the CoE member States in 2006-2007 is the European Manifesto for Multiple Cultural Affiliation of the CoE¹⁸ which notes the importance of reconciling belonging to several cultural traditions with a European citizenship, based on mutual recognition of different cultures and an attachment to shared values.

30. Other international Charters such as the Nara Document on Authenticity¹⁹ which includes traditions, spirit and feeling among the sources of information validating the authenticity of a heritage resource, reflect the considerable semantic evolution of the heritage concept and, in particular, its anthropological turn. It states that heritage properties must be considered and judged within the cultural contexts to which they belong and with the respect due to all cultures²⁰, questioning the 'top down' and authoritative definition of heritage in the context of globalisation and of the fact that the discontinuation of the past has become characteristic to this world.

31. The above-mentioned conventions and documents reflect the changing role of heritage communities and the social impact of preserving cultural heritage in contemporary Europe. They all recognise local communities as bearers of heritage values, as the custodians of the survival of cultural diversity, and consequently, of heritage values. Heritage identification, safeguard and management is community-led.

3.2 European heritage: projects and Initiatives

32. Several tools, initiatives and actions aim at strengthening awareness of European cultural heritage and to encourage intercultural dialogue.

33. Launched in 1987 with the Declaration of Santiago de Compostela, the Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe Programme proposes more than 30 Routes in 2020 on different themes, covering

¹⁶https://www.bbsr.bund.de/BBSR/EN/Publications/lzR/2002/4_5DejeantPons.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=3

¹⁷<https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/rms/0900001680083746>

¹⁸<https://rm.coe.int/16806abde8#:~:text=The%20European%20Manifesto%20for%20Multiple,Member%20States%20in%202006%2D2007.>

¹⁹<https://www.icomos.org/charters/nara-e.pdf>

²⁰ Steven Van Uytsel, Paulius Jurcys, *Heritage and Societies: Toward the 20th Anniversary of the Nara Document and Beyond*, Conference Report, Journal of Japanese Law (2012), No. 34, pp. 309-316.

landscape, monuments or sites as well as intangible heritage related to gastronomy, music or major figures of European art and literature. The programme works with local and regional authorities and aims to involve grassroots networks and associations, while collaborating with universities and professional organisations. It contributes to the preservation of a diverse heritage through theme-based and alternative tourist itineraries and cultural projects. The new Enlarged Partial Agreement on Cultural Routes (EPA) adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in 2010 is open to member and non-member States of the Council of Europe, thus encouraging trans-regional collaboration. There are 34 member States of the EPA in 2020.

In Georgia, the Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport signed with the National Association of Local Authorities of Georgia (NALAG) a memorandum of understanding on the promotion of the cultural routes of the CoE Programme in February 2020. This is a good practice example of initiatives by central authorities which consider the contribution of local authorities and promote the values of the CoE, namely cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and transfrontier exchanges.

34. The European Heritage Days²¹, organised since 1999 as a joint initiative of the Council of Europe and the European Union, provide access to rarely opened sites and is an incredibly popular success story. They are certainly the most widely celebrated participatory cultural events shared by the citizens of Europe. The Programme involves all levels of government, the regional and local authorities, civil society, the private sector and thousands of volunteers. It aims to promote a common understanding of cultural diversity and encourages the building of inclusive societies in Europe and beyond. A living demonstration of the attractiveness of cultural heritage, it has led to raising awareness among European citizens of the richness and cultural diversity of their continent, encouraging greater tolerance both in Europe and beyond national borders, and promoting the core principles of intercultural dialogue, partnership and civic responsibility. The numbers of associated sites and monuments and annual visitors demonstrate of the role of cultural heritage for the tourist attractiveness of European cities and regions.

35. The recent initiative of the European Commission in cooperation with UNESCO on “World Heritage Journeys in the EU”²² develops and promotes four thematic trans-European cultural routes (encompassing 34 World Heritage sites across 19 EU countries). Though the focus is on sites listed in the 1972 WH list – some of the “hidden gems” of the list – the Routes combine built heritage with intangible cultural heritage. The project aims to enable heritage and destination management authorities (DMOs) to develop common or shared objectives in terms of heritage and tourism governance in the regions concerned, working with local communities.

3.3 Approaching heritage innovatively: the role of local and regional authorities

36. The current prevailing approach to heritage is to approach it in an innovative way, i.e. as a field of social experimentation, exploration and testing of old and new ideas and options in different contexts. It is an innovation field for technological tools, but first and foremost for social innovation. Several studies²³ demonstrate the role cultural heritage can play on the regeneration of cities and regions thanks to smart restoration and adaptive re-use of heritage buildings.

37. Beyond this current consideration of heritage as a means for social well-being²⁴, community development, inclusion and cultural heritage policies are interlinked with the notion of sustainability. This introduces a link between the past, the present and the future which needs to be managed, not only because tomorrow’s heritage is created today, but also because cultural heritage tends to be considered as an active agent of sustainability, linked to several Sustainable Development Goals and, in particular, to SDG no 11 “Sustainable Cities”.

21 <http://www.europeanheritagedays.com/Home.aspx>

22 http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/tourism/offer/cultural_en

23 Mälkki & Schmidt-Thomé (2010) (eds.), *Integrating aims —built heritage in social and economic development*, Centre for Urban and Regional Studies Publications, Aalto <http://lib.tkk.fi/Reports/2010/isbn9789526032849.pdf>;

Zetti (2010) *Built heritage, local communities and the production of territory. Citizen participation in heritage preservation and improvement*, in Mälkki & Schmidt-Thomé (2010) (eds.), *Integrating aims —built heritage in social and economic development*, Centre for Urban and Regional Studies Publications, Aalto, pp. 233-251;

Fusco Girard & Gravagnuolo, 2017, *Circular economy and Cultural heritage/Landscape regeneration. Circular Business, financing and governance models for a competitive Europe. Circular economy and cultural heritage/landscape regeneration BDC*, Vol. 17, 1/2017

24 Grossi et al, *The Impact of Culture on the Subjective Wellbeing of the Italian Population: An Exploratory Study*, 2010

38. The PACE Recommendation on “The Value of cultural heritage in a democratic society” (2019), reminds us that “Cultural heritage is not simply about monuments, artefacts in museums, or even skills and traditions. In an increasingly cosmopolitan society, culture and heritage are about identity. They are indispensable tools to find innovative solutions to the problems of our societies”. It notes that “culture and heritage must be part of mainstream thinking regarding social and economic change”²⁵.

39. In this context, local and regional authorities have a major role to play. They are at the forefront of culture-led development thanks to greater local autonomy, the ability to attract high-talent individuals, and their proximity to their inhabitants' needs and potential. Cities that invest in culture can reap substantial rewards, attracting more jobs and human capital than other comparable cities²⁶. Big urban centres can play a leading role in this context. In rural areas, restoration and upgrading of cultural and natural heritage contributes to growth potential and sustainability. Integrated management of cultural and natural assets encourages people to discover and engage with both²⁷.

40. Restoration, conservation and promotion of cultural heritage requires expertise without which improvement and development is not possible. Local and regional authorities need to incorporate heritage identification and conservation into their policies and provide funding for conservation and management of cultural heritage. To achieve this, the development of expertise and cooperation with institutions that can provide such expertise is crucial in order to avoid neglect (with or without criminal intent) on the one hand and the trafficking of tangible cultural heritage objects on the other.

41. Considering that the local authorities have a direct relationship with their heritage, managed on a day-to-day basis, the rapporteurs underline that it is at this level that citizens must be encouraged to play a greater role in the implementation of this strategy, within the context of public action and in closer co-operation with the work carried out by the professionals and the public agencies concerned.

4. HOW CAN CULTURAL HERITAGE SERVE AS A TOOL FOR LOCAL AND REGIONAL SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT?

42. Cultural heritage can play various roles in contemporary European societies, particularly in relation to the action of local and regional authorities. In the context of development, it is a powerful engine driving economic growth, offering enormous opportunities for local and regional development, as cities generate ideas and foster innovation. The most impacted sectors by cultural heritage are tourism, construction, cultural and creative industries and real estate.

43. In general, cultural industries (of which cultural heritage is a part) create, produce and commercialise materials of cultural nature and transform cities which function as places of cultural consumption. They create employment and wealth and are among the most dynamic sectors in world trade. They have subsectors comprising the public, the intermediate (non-profit) and the private (market-oriented) sectors. Cultural heritage underpins all three sectors in a cross-cutting manner.²⁸

44. According to statistics provided by the European Heritage Heads Forum, which brings together the heads of the European state heritage authorities, statistics, the total GVA (gross value added) generated by the physical cultural heritage is € 303,7 billion yearly, or 4.66 % of the EU GVA of non-financial business economy. The number of jobs generated by the cultural heritage is in the order of 7,3 million persons or approximately 5.4 % of the EU employment of non-financial business economy.²⁹

45. A study published by the EU Committee of Regions in 2018 on “How to design cultural development strategies to boost local and regional competitiveness and comparative advantage: overview of good practices”³⁰ gives examples of positive experiences by local and regional authorities in the design and implementation of cultural development strategies. It recommends planning territorial development with culture as a resource, to create an institutional reference structure for cultural management, to provide

25 Dundee, *The value of cultural heritage in a democratic society*, Parliamentary Assembly, Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media. <http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-DocDetails-EN.asp?FileID=25440&lang=EN> 2019

26 According to the Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor, developed by the Commission's Joint Research Centre.

27 A New European Agenda for Culture, 2018, Communication from the Commissions to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions.

28 <https://www.interarts.net/descargas/interarts2557.pdf>

29 https://www.ehhf.eu/sites/default/files/DESIGN%20FOR%20DEVELOPING_FINAL_june.pdf

30 <https://cor.europa.eu/en/engage/studies/Documents/cultural-development-strategies/cultural-development-strategies.pdf>

opportunities for cultural asset owners and creativity carrier and last but not least, to gain and maintain visibility for the cultural image of cities and territories.

4.1 Cultural tourism as an instrument to safeguard, develop and produce resources for local communities

46. It is true that there are many instances of news in the media which focus on problems of over-tourism and tourism disruption in European cities and regions. However, cultural tourism, which can generate multiple sources of income if developed sustainably by empowered local communities, is a major tool for inclusive local development, in particular through the enhancement of sustainable cultural tourism.

47. These sources range from entrance fees to museums, production of documents and photographs, development of the craft and hospitality industry, transportation and restoration services and the information and communications technologies sector as well as revenues through taxes. Their management require close cooperation and partnerships between local and regional governments and the national level as well as with the private sector and the educational and professional sectors.³¹

48. As an example, the economy of the city of Florence in Italy is twice the national average. In 2015, 13.7 million visitors came to Florence. International tourism accounted for 73.7 percent of visitors, bringing a total of 2.5 billion euro to the city.³² Barcelona, in Spain, receives more than 7 million tourists each year, equivalent to 14 million overnight stays. The economic impact of tourism on the city is calculated at 22 million euros per day and generates 100,000 jobs.³³ Santorini, one of Greece's most popular destinations known for its geology, archaeological sites, architecture, wines and iconic sunset, attracted 1.7 million visitors in 2017 (excluding almost 800.000 cruise passenger visitors). The island has a population of 26.000 and the income from the 5.5 million overnight stays are about 1 billion euros annually³⁴

49. However, in many regions and cities and particularly in cities such as Barcelona, Amsterdam, and Venice, ranked highest on the over-tourism list,³⁵ cultural tourism is perceived as not only a scourge suffocating the city but also as creating a divide between those who take advantage from tourism (accommodation, restoration, tourism activities sectors) and the others who suffer by overcrowding, prices increase, rarefication of available housing and impoverishment of the public spaces.

50. Several local governments showed during the recent years the capacity to tackle such negative tourism phenomena and to fight against the disruptive effects of tourist rental platforms, huge cruise ships and uncontrolled low-cost airfare companies.

51. It is clear today that we need a new tourism paradigm for regions and cities to insure a more effective and shared governance between all territorial stakeholders. This new paradigm for tourism implies to open-up benefits not only to local inhabitants working in the tourism sector, but to all local communities. It considers the tourist as a citizen who elects to have a temporary residence in another place and who can offer expertise, knowledge, insights and not only economic benefits, corresponding to this paradigm shift. The phenomenon which is called "roots tourism" or community tourism and which refers to the mobility of the diaspora back to communities with which they perceive cultural identity is also part of economic development, but the tourist-local encounters are much more than just an economic encounter.

52. Rural areas and less known destinations are at present increasingly considered as entertainment places with strong authenticity potential: urban citizens feel the need to explore what they consider being traditional ways of living. In this context, alternative forms of tourism such as rural, slow and community tourism are increasingly viewed as a panacea, stimulating local economies, promoting social regeneration and improving the living conditions of rural communities. Less developed areas, often affected by rural poverty, deficient infrastructures, out-migration of the population and declining

31 <https://whc.unesco.org/document/6856>

32 <https://www.theflorentine.net/2016/05/27/florence-economy-double-nations/>

33 <http://www.portdebarcelona.cat/en/web/economic/4>

34 Journal *Tourism Planning & Development* - Volume 16, 2019 - Issue 4: Special issue: Overtourism and Tourismphobia: A Journey Through Four Decades of Tourism Development, Planning and Local Concerns. Guest editors: Claudio Milano, Marina Novelli and Joseph M. Cheer, <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2019.1569122>

35 <https://www.statista.com/statistics/778687/overtourism-worst-european-cities/>

agricultural rentability have a considerable potential in attracting those tourists in search of authentic and unique experiences.

EUROPEAN CAPITAL OF SMART TOURISM: The new title of **European Capital of Smart Tourism** instituted by the European Union in 2020 will contribute to diversify the criteria of a “successful” tourist urban destination. The title recompenses urban destinations physically accessible to travellers with special access needs, regardless of age, social or economic situation, with or without disabilities and easily reachable through different means of transport and with a strong transport system within the city. It aims to enhance sustainability by preserving the natural environment and resources while maintaining economic and socio-cultural development in a balanced way, remain digitally performant and culturally creative by making resourceful use of its cultural heritage.

TOURISM-FRIENDLY CITIES: Tourism Friendly cities is an Action Planning Network aimed at exploring how tourism can be made sustainable in medium-sized cities, reducing the negative impact on neighbourhoods and areas interested by different types of tourism and its related aspects through integrated and inclusive strategies, keeping a balance between the needs of the local community, in terms of quality of life and of services available, and the promotion of sustainable urban development at environmental, social and economic levels.³⁶

THE FARO CONVENTION NETWORK: The Network offers good examples of new and alternative ways of sustainable cultural tourism, both in cities and rural areas. One such initiative, based in the City of Venice is the FARO VENEZIA association, which seeks to make the city more attractive to its own residents and overcome the monoculture of tourism that has progressively depopulated the city. A network of local associations (combining research, culture and art), implements different forms of participative democracy to overcome the apparent gap between decision-makers and citizens. To reinforce the attractiveness of the city beyond mass tourism, the initiative aims to promote traditional local craftsmanship and the transformation of heritage sites (such as the *Arsenale*) into useful places for all citizens³⁷.

CULTURAL ROUTES OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE PROGRAMME: Sustainability, heritage and governance are at the heart of Council of Europe’s initiatives such as the Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe programme. One of its main focus is the sustainable cultural development of the communities involved and the promotion of a responsible sustainable tourism. Among the 38 Cultural Routes certified by the Council of Europe, 90 % cross rural areas, taking the visitors “off the beaten track” and promoting dialogue between urban and rural cultures. One of these is the Santiago de Compostela Pilgrim Routes (certified since 1987). From its beginnings, the concept of hospitable networks has led to the development of a network of small and medium sized businesses (SMEs), initially religious, which federated agricultural and medical “clusters” to feed and care for pilgrims. The network of hostels for pilgrims travelling along the Santiago de Compostela Pilgrim Routes in Spain continues to contribute to the social and economic development of the towns where they are located, supporting SMEs, in the context of the development policy of the territory promoted by the Xunta the Galicia (regional authority).

53. The rapporteurs acknowledge the indubitable importance of cultural heritage management for economic growth if managed sustainably but also highlight that this management must be guided by the basic principles of local democracy, aiming for of inclusion, diversity and respect for fundamental rights. They also note the impact on COVID-19 on tourism and the creative industries. According to UNESCO, currently, 89% of all World Heritage properties are totally or partially closed. Lockdowns brought critical restoration and rehabilitation work to a stop. Museums and other cultural institutions are losing millions in revenue each day and artists all around the world are unable to make ends meet just when the public turns to culture for support in these difficult times.³⁸ Urgent intervention by public authorities is needed at all levels of governance to address the issue and to re-think and re-design policy responses to fundamental crisis situations in light of the COVID-19 outbreak, particularly in light of the fact that a lot of activities in the cultural field will be done at the local level because of the epidemic.

³⁶ Local community & tourists together for urban sustainability, available at <https://urbact.eu/tourism-friendly-cities>

³⁷ Council of Europe, *The Faro Convention: the way forward with heritage*, April 2020.

³⁸ <https://en.unesco.org/covid19/cultureresponse>

4.2. Localised cultural heritage: Multiple identities, reconciliation of narratives and social cohesion

54. Any belief that a “European Cultural Heritage” is consensually defined, understood and accepted by all Europeans is illusory. The conception of Europe, and consequently of its cultural heritage, differs from nation to nation, from region to region and among the different and often very diverse cultural, social and political groups within nations and regions. Heritage is not always a factor of cohesion, it can also be a reason for divisions, tensions and conflicts³⁹.

55. In general terms, there is a tension in Europe between a supra-national, more cosmopolitan identity and a more deeply rooted approach in the local, regional and national space. This tension is often analysed in political terms between a top-down approach, supported by EU, and a more bottom-up, nationalistic (and even populist or right-wing) approach emerging locally.

56. Europe needs to go beyond “virtual reality of a simulated Europe” which “no one will be the part of”⁴⁰ and anchor itself through cultural heritage places, which, on the one hand, localise and acknowledge the so-called ‘high places’ (or hotspots) of European construction and on the other hand can re-territorialise and re-historicise the continent through linking ‘local’ and ‘global’ tendencies and interpretations pragmatically⁴¹.

57. Localised cultural heritage offers alternative narratives to a de-territorialized and de-historicized Europe⁴². European cities are examples of such multi-layered narratives, since they are both the agents of Europeanisation – as cities of peace treaties or of capitals of European culture - and of cultural differentiation as particular and differentiated urban landscapes.

58. All cultures and societies possess their own narratives relating to their cultural heritage. Imposing a common European narrative is not only counterproductive but it also conveys messages that contradict the major conventions and documents presented in part II above. However, this is what often happens and, the need to impose a consensual narrative, masks and underestimates the power and resilience of local narratives.

59. Social groups may feel deprived of their references due to globalisation and to the accelerated change of their economic and social conditions. There is a need therefore of a “gap reconciliation” between the (top-down) European cultural narratives, the national ones and the local communities’ ones. The reconciliation of narratives has been used in recent years around the world in order to reduce inter-group conflicts and to enhance peacebuilding and reconciliation between adversaries. This may imply the re-writing of national narratives to include minority groups. It also implies, for minorities outside Europe, connecting these narratives to the rest of the world.

60. Cultural heritage can be used as a medium to offer alternatives to exclusive identities and to provide inclusive and robust references and practices for the recognition of heritage communities but we must be aware that this will not happen spontaneously, by the sole power of a “unite and share” heritage discourse. A considerable amount of work must be done to have a thorough discussion of the opposing and conflictual points before reconciling narratives can be established.

61. The rapporteurs underline that local and regional authorities can play a major role in such a reconciliation of narratives, by facilitating both locally and transnationally the expression and exchanges of those narratives.

39 The COHESIFY Project (UNDERSTANDING THE IMPACT OF EU COHESION POLICY ON EUROPEAN IDENTIFICATION) reminds moreover that the very concept of heritage is historically built in Europe in a differentiated way. This remains still visible today between South and the North, the East and the West. The COHESIFY project³⁹ deals with the interpretative differences of cultural heritage not only between bigger European regions, but also between national discourses and sub-national recognitions <http://www.cohesify.eu/the-project/>

40 European Commission, Innovation in Cultural Heritage Research For an integrated European Research Policy, p. 13 <http://openarchive.icomos.org/2323/1/KI0118044ENN.en%20%281%29.pdf>

41 Idem.

42 European Commission, Innovation in Cultural Heritage Research For an integrated European Research Policy, p. 13 <http://openarchive.icomos.org/2323/1/KI0118044ENN.en%20%281%29.pdf>

THE EUROPEAN ROUTE OF JEWISH HERITAGE (certified “Cultural Route of the Council of Europe” since 2005): The European Route of Jewish Heritage aims to preserve and promote Jewish heritage, developing tourism, as well as providing an in depth exploration of the subject matter of cultural diversity and the recognition of “The Other”. Jewish heritage is rooted in Europe, with a story of migrations, persecutions and precariousness, but also of exchanges, humanism and a profusion of mutual enrichment. The European Day of Jewish Heritage is its flagship project. The event has been taking place since 1999 in some 25 European countries and aims at promoting a wider knowledge and a deeper understanding of the Jewish people and their culture, as part of the European culture and heritage, through a wide range of activities such as open doors at synagogues and museums, exhibitions, workshops and concerts. The Day raises awareness of Jewish culture to the wider society, in the belief that a greater awareness of the culture, tradition and life of the different communities living in the same space helps people know “the other”, strengthening social exchange and dialogue between cultures.

4.3 Social, cultural and economic inclusion of disconnected communities

62. Cultural heritage can be a tool for social, cultural and economic inclusion of disconnected communities.

63. There is no single definition of social inclusion. It can mean different things from a social policy, economics and workplace perspective. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) defines inclusive society as a society in which every individual has an active role to play. Such a society is based on fundamental values of equity, equality, social justice, and human rights and freedoms, as well as on the principles of tolerance and embracing diversity.

64. Being socially included means that people have the resources, opportunities and capabilities they need to learn (participate in education and training). They must be able to work (participate in employment, unpaid or voluntary work including family and carer responsibilities), engage (connect with people, use local services and participate in local, cultural, civic and recreational activities) and have a voice (influence decisions that affect them).

65. Social inclusion is closely related to the concept of social cohesion and its impact of globalisation, economic change and fears. Social cohesion is built on a shared vision of universal values, on a property of a group or community with shared goals and a continuous process of achieving social harmony). The key factors in this process are:

- economic (levels of unemployment and poverty, income distribution, population mobility, health, life satisfaction and sense of security, and government responsiveness to issues of poverty and disadvantage);
- political (levels of political participation and social involvement, including the extent of voluntarism and the development of social capital, understood in terms of networks, norms and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit);
- sociocultural (levels of consensus and divergence (homogeneity and heterogeneity) on issues of local and national significance).

66. The socially inclusionary potential of cultural heritage originally focused principally on heritage sites and museums. There is however more and more attention being paid to the wider built heritage that surrounds our everyday lives. The current UNESCO list of intangible cultural heritage contains 463 elements corresponding to 124 countries.⁴³ This positive development since the adoption of the UNESCO 2003 treaty should be accompanied at the local and regional level by the development of a framework for considering how this wider built heritage might contribute to social inclusion⁴⁴.

67. The rapporteurs draw attention to the fact that social inclusion harnesses our diversity as a fuel for small business formation, creativity and innovation. It can be a source of economic strength and higher living standards. The contribution of migrant entrepreneurial activities in Europe has been increasing

⁴³ <https://ich.unesco.org/en/00011?type=00002>

⁴⁴ Pendlebury J., Townshend T., Gilroy R., 2004, *The Conservation of English Cultural Built Heritage: A Force for Social Inclusion?*, Volume 10, 2004 - Issue 1 Pages 11-31

over the last decade. They contribute to economic growth and employment, often by rejuvenating neglected crafts and trades. They also form an important bridge to global markets and are important for the integration of migrants into employment.

Prehistoric Rock Art Trails (certified “Cultural Route of the Council of Europe” since 2010): “Siega Verde” is a site, member of the Prehistoric Rock Art trails, located in Salamanca, Spain. In 1988, cave paintings were discovered next to the river and the area was closed with fences by the public administration. In 2010 there was recognition of the site by UNESCO. The local population felt displaced and robbed by the Regional Administration. It became a tourist destination without local participation or approval. In 2006, having acknowledged the problem, the rural development agency that integrates towns in the area worked in cooperation with national, international and regional institutions, through a bottom-up strategy. The local population started to get involved, for example, participating in promotion films, visiting fairs, promotion workshops, etc. The management of the site started to be carried out by the inhabitants themselves, allowing the site to become a cultural and educational resource for the population. The feeling of identity, belonging and property for the site is now very strong.

Stories from Museum to Museum (Maxxi Museum, Italy, since 2012)

The project “*Narrations from Museum to Museum*”⁴⁵ aims to facilitate the integration of young refugees - teenager migrants living without parents or families. Run in close cooperation between a non-profit organisation (*CivicoZero*, supported by *Save the Children*) and the MAXXI Contemporary Arts Museum in Rome. *The project* aims at enhancing the social role of cultural heritage as a vehicle of identity, as well as to stimulate a positive process of integration, a sense of belonging and self-esteem, and to encourage curiosity for the common cultural heritage. Young participants were invited to share personal experiences or emotions evoked by selected artworks from MAXXI and then guided to produce their own artworks to be presented in museums or at events.

The Whole Village Project: With the help of the Mihai Eminescu Trust, the Whole Village Project was born as an initiative aimed at preserving the Saxon heritage in the intercultural village of Viscri (Romania). The initiative focuses on turning the local heritage into a resource for all community members (Roma, Romanians, Hungarians and Saxons), enabling them to make the best use of it through tourism, agriculture and craftsmanship, with the objective of overcoming any potential challenges of integration.

68. The rapporteurs also note that people tend not to engage with cultural heritage because of factors such as isolation, poverty and exclusion from education. The promise of digitalisation as a process that would democratise and widely open access to cultural heritage as a social resource has not been fulfilled to the extent expected. On the other hand, the digital divide has mixed existing and new forms of exclusion.

69. Disconnection is also related to disabilities that affect people in varying ways, ranging from an impairment to mobility restriction. Local and regional authorities need to take these (sometimes contradictory) factors on board when devising their policies related to cultural heritage.

Talking Houses - Shared Stories⁴⁶: The joint policy challenge of the “Come in! Transfer network partner cities” is to mobilise citizens and foster civilian power and urban stewardship through raising awareness towards the values of built heritage to decrease social isolation. This also highlights the brokerage role of municipalities (creating conditions for stakeholders to creatively shape urban environment and public policies). The main aim of the good practice is primarily not to protect buildings, but to encourage civilian power alongside the built environment as a catalyst. Its broad mission is to initiate a common discussion about urban revival and to inspire the establishment and strengthening of residential communities and to take action against urban social isolation by using cultural heritage and built environment as a tool.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ <https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/intpract/narrations-from-museum-to-museum>

⁴⁶ URBACT, *It was simply amazing, a real treasure-hunting II*, 2019 <https://urbact.eu/it-was-simply-amazing-real-treasure-hunting-ii>

⁴⁷ URBACT, *Come in! - Talking Houses /Shared Stories at Budapest*, 2019 <https://urbact.eu/come-talking-houses-shared-stories-budapest-0>

Catching the missing voices: The LINKS⁴⁸ project invites private owners to be involved in urban regeneration projects, whether the priority is pedestrianisation, renovation of iconic buildings, cultural vitality or attracting families to the centre. Their participation is vital, from their input to development policies through to the implementation of planned actions. LINKS cities note that there is room for improvement in governance structures and encourage integrated and inclusive urban policies. The aim is to “to catch the missing voices” and turn constraints into opportunities. Several cities participating in the LINKS project consider that it is important to come close to citizens in their own neighbourhood and with individual approaches.

4.4 Intercultural dialogue on cultural heritage: Exploring shared history and roots, building common projects

70. The White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue of the Council of Europe states that “Intercultural dialogue can contribute to addressing major global challenges – such as conflict prevention and resolution, integrating refugees, countering violent extremism, and protecting cultural heritage”⁴⁹. The paper reminds us that we experience an increasingly pressing question of the “meeting of cultures” provoked both by the movement of people and by the increasingly porous nature of our national identities. We are living through an osmosis of cultures facilitated by travel, technology and the interconnectedness of our contemporary economies and cultures. In a context in which migratory fluxes between EU and neighbourhood countries are constant and continuous, intercultural dialogue can contribute in promoting inclusion and fighting radicalisation.

71. Cultural heritage can enable and encourage participation in cultural and societal life, intercultural dialogue⁵⁰ and cultural diversity, especially with migrant populations, only if several conditions are brought together. In Europe, an important part of migration originates in the former colonies and are the result of a complex and often traumatic past which can still influence contemporary relationships between migrants and European host societies. Cultural heritage cannot be dissociated from post-colonial considerations and narratives. This implies a real dialogue which accepts and even encourages controversy and confrontation and does not avoid tackling and openly discuss migration as a political issue.

72. Cultural heritage is also an important factor of visibility for migrant populations in the public arena. Migrants, often perceived as invisible and not always legitimate - since they are seen as temporary populations, provisory settled in the host country - can present and share their own heritage narratives. However, in order to be a ‘real’ dialogue this implies the active participation of the host communities, the embedment in local civil societies and ideally the involvement of perennial structures, within the framework of sustainable organizations. The condition of the sustainability of intercultural dialogue is to go beyond simple recognition of otherness in order to actively involve, acculturate and transform both migrants and nationals. The knowledge of the cultural background of migrants is a very important factor for their smoother integration into community and their harmonious coexistence. The discussion around cultural heritage invites migrants to reflect on current problems, deal with them as active citizens and at the same time it creates opportunities for social interaction between young people by fostering dialogue among students from different countries in order to develop a mutual understanding.

73. The situation of communities or people who do not have tangible cultural heritage “inherited from the past” such as Roma and Travellers but who nevertheless find ways to maintain their heritage opens up a field of action where local authorities can play an active role through data collection, studies and projects for preservation of intangible cultural heritage such as language, music and traditions, in close cooperation with the Roma communities themselves.

74. Integration of inter-cultural dialogue is very rewarding for cultural institutions which are often perceived as elitist. Developing cultural projects with and for refugees and migrants may help such institutions to be more inclusive and move towards greater cultural democracy. Public spaces such as

48 URBACT, *Future-proof Historic Centres* Final Report, p. 23, 2013

https://urbact.eu/sites/default/files/import/Projects/LINKS/outputs_media/urbact_links_final_report.pdf

49 *Joint Communication of the Commission and the European External Action Service, towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations* (JOIN(2016) 29, 8 June 2016), <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52016JC0029&from=EN>

50 European Union, *How culture and the arts can promote intercultural dialogue in the context of migratory and refugee crisis*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2017.

squares and streets, schools, railway stations, public transportation, hospitals, etc. are places of encounter and social mix.

4.5 Cities as cultural diplomacy actors

75. Cities, and in particular large and medium-size cities, are not only important cultural and creative hubs but also important cultural diplomacy actors⁵¹. Well-connected internationally, cities are global political actors and engage directly with a wide range of geographical locations. Their international cultural action is symptomatic of the broader emergence of cities as global political actors that are taking on responsibilities that were traditionally the preserve of nation-states.

76. City twinning programmes, city networks and decentralised cooperation, offer advanced models of cultural cooperation centring on people-to-people exchanges. Their collaborative logic and their proximity to citizens offers fertile experimentation grounds for innovative participatory models and strategies. They allow to move beyond a government-to-government, towards a people-to-people collaboration that stimulates 'a new spirit of dialogue' to respond to the specific needs of different cultural communities and institutions in their territories.

77. Globalisation has the power to connect people beyond borders but is also, reversely, pushing people to reconcile with local roots⁵². Diaspora communities in different cities organise cultural projects to maintain relations with their countries of origin. Even if some of these projects receive municipal subsidies designated for local community activities, city governments do not always succeed in embedding these activities into their wider international cultural relations strategy.

78. Recognition of the ties developed in cities with their diaspora communities locally may represent an important component of the city's cultural diplomacy, since they have the potential to become bridges to third countries. Urban diaspora diplomacy should be more recognized as an official mechanism of EU strategy for international cultural relations.

Refugee Integration Projects EACEA (2016): Creative Europe, the European EC's Voices of Culture initiative⁵³, 'Promoting intercultural dialogue and bringing communities together through culture in shared public spaces' Commission's framework programme for support of the culture and audio-visual sectors special call for proposals on refugee integration (2016) selected 12 projects which may give EU citizens the opportunity to discover, learn from and understand the values and cultures of refugees and migrants and rediscover and enrich their own⁵⁴.

İzmir's Mediterranean Academy: Maintaining a Spirit of Dialogue⁵⁵: İzmir, Turkey's third largest city, has historically had an open and progressive outlook. Starting in October 2009, the İzmir Metropolitan Municipality launched the İzmir Cultural Workshop. As part of the project scientists, artists and citizens were invited to formulate their vision of a city of innovation and design and develop relations with other Mediterranean cities. In a context in which Turkey-EU relations have been hampered by political rhetoric during the past decade, such initiatives show that a spirit of dialogue can be maintained at city level and that civil society can continue to collaborate, exchange and celebrate their common values and heritage.

4.6 Civil society as a place of dialogue and learning

79. The changing perception of cultural heritage brings civil societies to the very centre of the cultural heritage preservation and safeguarding. As the responsibility for safeguarding becomes increasingly a task for the broader society, also tasked with the use of heritage for the benefit of society, new tools, new platforms of dialogue and a new governance are needed in order to allow the mediation between local and regional authorities, governments and the civil society.

51 Abdullah., Molho, 2020, *Towards a Multi-level Strategy for EU External Cultural Relations: Bringing Cities on Board*, European University Institute, RSCAS | Policy Brief | Issue 2020/03

https://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/65897/RSCAS_PB_2020_03.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

52 Vroonhof, Clarke, Van der Graaf, *Platforms on the Future of Cultural Heritage: A problem solving approach. Report on the Dublin Platform on 'Heritage and Social innovation'* European Expert Network on Culture and Audiovisual (EENCA), 2019.

53 www.voicesofculture.eu

54 https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/creative-europe/selection-results/refugee-integration-projects-eacea-122016_en

55 <https://www.izmeda.org/>

80. Cultural heritage governance implies the redefinition of cultural heritage communities as heterogeneous realities⁵⁶. Even if we often speak about “the” local community, local communities are diverse, both socially and culturally. Heritage communities reclaim their cultural rights and the (re-)acquisition of their cultural goods. Responsibility for cultural heritage safeguarding becomes increasingly a task for the broader society, not just governments and experts⁵⁷.

81. Therefore, community engagement should exceed the community just being heard. In practice, there are four possible levels of possible community engagement:

- *ignoring*: Leaving the community out of the process and fully ignoring its attitude and expectations from the evolving cultural heritage);
- *informing*: Planners and decision-makers inform the community about the process, yet, expect the community not to partake in the planning, development and/or the management of the site and/or to define its own interests in this process) and
- *involving*: Listening to the community's voice and interests and considering them as part of the overall process).
- *enabling*: Facilitating the initiatives coming from communities by bringing them to the attention of planners and decision-makers.

82. In terms of level of centrality of communities' engagement in the process, there are three possible levels: the lower level of communities that play only a minor role in the planning, development and management of cultural heritage. The second level refers to communities that play as equal stakeholders and the third level depicts communities that are leading the process, their engagement level is high, and their interests and limits are put in the centre of the process.

83. The levels of community engagement and their centrality in the process may be dynamic and change over time and as the cultural heritage moves from the planning stage, through the development stage and finally reaches steady state operation.

84. Participation needs both committed public authorities and an empowered civil society. Public participation ideally implies that the public's contribution will influence the decision. It includes giving feedback to participants on how their input affected the decision⁵⁸.

85. The participation of young people to this process is crucial. A dynamic and mobile group, young people can contribute to information exchange, enhance peer-to-peer education, connect youth and youth organisations to create a network of knowledge and partnerships on cultural heritage.⁵⁹ UNESCO, in its “Youth and Culture” information sheet, states that the “right of young people to access, enjoy and actively participate in cultural life is enshrined in international law, forming a key part of their cultural and human rights. Participation in cultural life is necessary for young people to gain an understanding of their own culture and that of others, which in turn broadens their horizons, strengthens their ability to peacefully resolve conflicts and fosters respect for cultural diversity”⁶⁰.

86. Cognizant of the added value youth can bring to the promotion of cultural heritage, international organisations have been active in developing and supporting networks of young people engaged in cultural heritage.

87. The Cultural Routes programme for instance, has identified the implementation of cultural and educational exchanges for young Europeans as one of the priority field of actions in its rules for the award of the “Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe” certification [[Resolution CM Res\(2013\)67](#)]. Promoting in-depth exchanges aimed at developing the concept of European citizenship; organising exchanges of young people from different social backgrounds and regions of Europe and involving educational institutions at various levels are among the priorities of these initiatives.

56 European Commission, Innovation in Cultural Heritage Research For an integrated European Research Policy, p. 37 <http://openarchive.icomos.org/2323/1/KI0118044ENN.en%20%281%29.pdf>

57 https://ec.europa.eu/culture/sites/culture/files/report_on_the_dublin_platform_on_heritage_and_social_innovation.pdf

58 European Commission, Directorate General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture, 2018, *Participatory governance of cultural heritage*, Report of the OMC working group of Member States' experts, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/1efe98ad-437b-11e8-a9f4-01aa75ed71a1/language-en>

59 Protection of cultural heritage: can young people make a difference? Recommendation to UNESCO, governments, civil society and youth organizations http://www.ngo-unesco.net/en/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Report_Protection_of_cultural_heritage.pdf

60 UNESCO, *Youth and Culture*, http://www.unesco.org/culture/culture-sector-knowledge-management-tools/07_Info%20Sheet_Youth.pdf

88. In 2018, the European Year of Cultural Heritage, when the EU project "DiscoverEU" offered 18-year-olds the opportunity to discover Europe's cultural heritage through free travel passes, over 15,000 young Europeans received a pass to go to up to 4 countries, predominantly via train, to explore the diversity of Europe's heritage and even attend some of the events related to the European year.

89. Within the framework of the European Year of Cultural Heritage 2018, the European Commission and UNESCO launched a joint project on empowering European youth through a "Young Heritage Professionals Forum" aimed at raising young people's awareness of the importance of heritage diversity, its conservation, enhancement and transmission. The Forum was a great success in creating a network of young heritage professionals who can act as Cultural Heritage Messengers in their own countries and communities and spread the word about the strong potential of heritage to drive positive social change. As messengers, the young practitioners will actively raise awareness about the importance of caring for and transmitting our shared heritage.

90. The rapporteurs call on local and regional authorities to involve and encourage young people to engage with cultural heritage and also to co-create with them projects that will contribute to exchanges between cities and regions and contribute to sustainable local and regional development.

ATRIUM - Architecture of Totalitarian Regimes of the 20th Century In Europe's Urban Memory (certified "Cultural Route of the Council of Europe" since 2014): The ATRIUM route project explores new ways of ethical and responsible storytelling and tourism experiences for students, raising awareness on the ATRIUM Cultural Route and involves five partners located in Italy (Bari, Ferrara and Forli) and Croatia (Labin and Zadar). In Forli, the "Memowalk ATRIUM Plus" project was developed by young people for young people. Students from a local High School created a "story-telling" tour of the city, offering an understanding of this period of history. The walk is punctuated by images and sounds that help to acquire deeper insight of life under a totalitarian regime. It allows younger generations to have a better understanding of the past and the region's historical heritage, inviting them to become active actors in creating a more democratic future that is free of the fear and hate produced by totalitarian ideologies.

City of Zadar, Croatia⁶¹: The European Young Heritage Professionals Forum which took place in Zadar in 2019, proposed two local case studies, namely the Art of Dry-Stone Walling and the Venetian Works of Defence, which offered participants an opportunity to experience (in a direct and hands-on manner) the link between tangible and intangible heritage and how active participation at local level is essential to protect them. Lectures, interactive games and group work enabled participants to consolidate the newly acquired knowledge. The 28 young Cultural Heritage Messengers designed interactive awareness-raising activities around the case studies. Equipped with maps and creative props, the participants took over the streets of Zadar to engage with residents and hear about what the practice of Dry-Stone Walling or the Venetian Works of Defence means to them. In about two hours, over 300 people took part in this exercise.

5. 'BLIND SPOTS' AND THE NEED TO ENGAGE IN FURTHER ANALYSIS

91. Cultural heritage management as a tool for local and regional development, though already a subject of research, requires further research, analysis and understanding. The rapporteurs underline that it is necessary to identify the areas that need further development and to highlight emerging issues for which it is urgent to produce new tools and instruments or to more actively implement policies on the basis of existing studies.

5.1 Lack of data and indicators beyond strict economic considerations

92. There is a general consensus that cultural heritage is a resource that can trigger economic, social and environmental benefits to society.

93. Cultural heritage is responsible for part of the creative economy and may attract highly skilled workers thus improving the overall quality of life. It may have a positive impact on public authorities encouraging innovation in their governance solutions and productivity. However, more generally, the

⁶¹ <https://whc.unesco.org/en/events/1489/>

question about the impact of cultural heritage enhancement, accessibility and embedment in everyday life on public health and well-being awaits to be answered.

94. More social indicators are needed to take into consideration a more general range of benefits from cultural heritage⁶². Despite the huge progress of recent years, there is still insufficient information on the effect that investments on cultural heritage have on territories beyond a strict impact on growth and jobs, which makes it difficult to explore, more comprehensively, the global impact on society.

Funded by the European Regional Development Fund, the on-going **European Observation Network for Territorial Development (ESPON)** "Cultural Heritage as a Source of Societal Well-being in European Regions" programme aims at providing empirical evidence on the impact of material cultural heritage on the most important economic sectors in 10 selected countries and regions. Beyond results, it is hoped that it will offer common theoretical framework defining societal domains and dimensions of societal well-being on which cultural heritage has an impact.⁶³

5.2 Lack of frameworks linking cultural heritage and social-capital building

95. Social inclusion and social capital, defined by the OECD as "networks together with shared norms, values and understandings that facilitate co-operation within or among groups"⁶⁴ are key concepts for inclusive growth defined as "economic growth that is distributed fairly across society and creates opportunities for all".

96. Cultural heritage plays an important role in social capital-building and, beyond, to social inclusion. However, few frameworks and indicators for networks (structure, expansion, transactions and types) exist today for measuring social capital.

5.3 Lack of generalised bottom-up and inclusive governance schemes

97. Despite extensive and efficient coordination among European governments, local and regional authorities, civil society, there are still important barriers to be broken⁶⁵. There are still hard-to-reach audiences not participating in cultural heritage-related activities and who need to be specifically targeted. Existing studies are often factual and insist on "success stories", most of them evaluated in the short term. There is still a considerable need for a "good governance" framework followed with appropriate indicators (particularly in the long-term) in a transregional context.

5.4 Inequalities and "territorial injustice" between regions and city areas

98. Cultural heritage is a means for spatial and territorial justice, and a tool for the development of remote and peripheral areas⁶⁶. Heritage development in peripheral regions or peripheral neighbourhoods in European metropolises has not yet fully been used as a means for spatial justice. Despite the importance of the existing tools in a European level, there are still regions and urban peripheries that do not capture any benefit. This is due to several reasons and mainly to a "negative spiral" from which these regions and/or urban areas are historically suffering (deindustrialization, desertification, marginalisation, etc.). This spatial imbalance functions as a "territorial injustice".

99. These peripheral areas need targeted and specific tools and instruments in order to develop their cultural heritage. Social housing of the 20th century, warehouses and industrial spaces, farms and modest rural buildings, represent a specific type of cultural heritage which, can serve territorial development if specific measures are taken; local and regional authorities are the most appropriate bodies to design and implement these new tools and instruments.

62 Bold J., Pickard R., *An Integrated approach to cultural heritage*, The Council of Europe's Technical Co-operation and Consultancy Programme, 2018, Council of Europe, Strasbourg <https://rm.coe.int/an-integrated-approach-to-cultural-heritage-the-council-of-europe-s-te/1680792e6f>

63 Call for tenders for "ESPON Cultural Heritage as a Source of Societal Well-being in European Regions", 2018 <https://www.espon.eu/call-tenders-espon-cultural-heritage-source-societal-well-being-european-regions>

64 Keeley, 2007: 103

65 European Agenda for Culture Workplan for Culture 2011-2014, 2012 https://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/culture/policy/strategic-framework/documents/omc-report-access-to-culture_en.pdf

66 The role of culture in non-urban areas of the European Union. <https://voicesofculture.eu/2019/10/10/the-role-of-culture-in-non-urban-areas-of-the-european-union/>

5.5 Weak connexion between cultural heritage, eco-restoration and contemporary building culture

100. Cultural heritage can play a major role for the sustainability of urban and rural environments, in several ways. This implies, first of all, to consider contemporary buildings as part of future heritage. In the line of the “Baukultur” as formulated in the Davos Declaration (2018) “there is an urgent need for a holistic, culture-centred approach to the built environment and for a humanistic view of the way we collectively shape the places we live in and the legacy we leave behind”⁶⁷. Then, we must ensure and enable adequate investments, public and private, into quality heritage-led regeneration.

101. For instance, abandoned or underused heritage buildings (former schools, railway stations, abandoned cinemas, theatres, hotels, offices, former public housing and “ghost villages”, caserns or hospitals) are places embedded with social memories. They can offer a ground for the building of projects rooted in the local communities. Beyond this, they also can serve as ground for sustainable urban regeneration by financing and managing the re-use of built heritage in cities in line with circular economy models. They can also serve to sustain craft skills for which there appears to be no current market. Globally working to the reintegration of these spaces, encourages learning and training of new workers and passing on skills. Reconversion/rehabilitation projects can be enriched by the active participation of citizens, communities and civil society organisations. Creative and respectful interaction between the protection of the built heritage and contemporary contributions will contribute to the heritage of tomorrow.

102. High-quality eco-restoration and renovation mastered by local people knowing the techniques and the advantages of quality renovation and understanding of traditional building techniques for the cultural value of heritage goes far beyond mere enhancement/renovation of built heritage; it may boost the local economy, enhance cultural diversity and prevent the decline or loss of unique skills and practices.⁶⁸ There is, however, much more to do in order to create a “virtuous continuity” between restoration, renovation and local communities. City regeneration cannot be dissociated from social developments. A city’s regeneration is deeply linked with its social structure and local social needs. It implies citizens’ participation in restoration and renovation projects.

5.6 Lack of efficient tools for the preservation of the intangible aspects of urban or rural landscapes

103. Though there is an extensive number of tools, instruments and regulations for restoration and renovation of built heritage, few existing tools can protect the intangible characteristics of a living place. Historic city centres in particular are a crucial part of Europe’s cultural heritage, and a potential force for economic development and social cohesion. However, their aesthetics and attractivity tends to transform them into open air museums. Museumification and subsequent touristification contributes to the departure of local residents. How can they be turned into sustainable, diverse and attractive places to live, while preserving the architectural and cultural heritage, and respecting the environment? How to improve rundown areas in historical city centres without displacing fragile residents? And how to reach the right balance of residential, commercial and tertiary functions, avoiding museumification?⁶⁹

5.7 Need for a new tourism paradigm in relation to cultural heritage

104. Several studies (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2018)⁷⁰ concluded on the beneficial nature of tourism from an economic point of view. However, economic benefits do not always coincide with social ones. In recent years, tourism has been dominated by the paradigm of “overtourism”⁷¹. Local communities need a change of paradigm in order to include indicators for tourism development not just

67 Davos Declaration, 2018 <https://davosdeclaration2018.ch/fr/programme/>

68 Dundee, *The value of cultural heritage in a democratic society*, Parliamentary Assembly, Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media. <http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-DocDetails-EN.asp?FileID=25440&lang=EN> 2019

69 The hyper-protection of the built environment at the expense of the social one. For example, in the Marais neighborhood, in Paris, the shop windows keep the old inscriptions related to different trades (Boulagerie; Boucherie, Chevaline, etc.) which are protected, but unfortunately, as no mechanisms exist to keep also everyday commerce which used to be hosted there, one can only find expensive clothing shops or art galleries in the beautifully restored former bakeries.

70 World Travel and Tourism Council, *Travel and Tourism Economic Impact*, 2018 <https://www.slovenia.info/uploads/dokumenti/raziskave/europe2018.pdf>

71 Peeters, Gössling, Klijs, Milano, Novelli, Dijkmans, Eijgelaar, Hartman, Heslinga, Isaac, Mitas, Moretti, Nawijn, Papp and Postma, Research for TRAN Committee - *Overtourism: impact and possible policy responses*, European Parliament, Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies, 2018, Brussels

in economic terms, but also for the well-being of local communities. Qualitative indicators are still missing, and the success of a destination is still mainly evaluated in quantitative terms (and even those focus more on the numbers of visitors than on the spending on the local economy).

105. The launch by the European Commission in 2019, via the Horizon 2020 programme, of a call for proposals to fund projects assessing how the presence, development, decline or absence of cultural tourism has affected the development of European regions and urban areas is an important step in this direction and should be expanded.

106. The rapporteurs are of the opinion that further study will be required on responsible tourism, particularly in light of the challenges and changes brought on by the impact of the COVID-19 crisis in all localities, but particularly in urban areas. The uncertainty of the post-COVID-19 situation does not allow to comment more at this stage, but it is becoming more and more apparent that there will be a need for substantial measures to relaunch a severely affected tourism economy.

6. HOW CAN LOCAL AND REGIONAL AUTHORITIES ADDRESS THE SHORTCOMINGS?

107. There is a set of measures that need to be taken both at the local and regional levels and by other stakeholders in terms of acquiring information and improving their knowledge-base, developing policies, taking action and networking. These include the following:

6.1 Qualitative measurement and quantitative indicators (link to “blind spot” 5.1)

108. As regards information/knowledge, qualitative measurement of the impact of cultural heritage, must be measured in a more systematic and holistic way by all relevant stakeholders and operators by identifying and disseminating good practices and by introducing a requirement for projects which are recipients of funds (EU or otherwise) to conduct a holistic impact assessment, measuring both short and long-term impacts.

109. As mentioned above, cultural heritage impacts are measured primarily with quantitative indicators. There is an urgent need to implement qualitative indicators as well, to more holistically grasp the cross-sectorial impacts of cultural heritage at all levels of governance, particularly regional and local, in order to raise awareness of the whole chain of downstream benefits that investment in cultural heritage can bring across a wide range of policy areas. There is also a need for inter-sectorial research projects, the development of indicators and the methodology of assessment to evaluate cultural heritage in its complexity.

6.2 Participatory governance ((link to “blind spots” 5.2 and 3)

110. As regards policy making, heritage policies must be given the centrality they deserve in contemporary societies). Cultural heritage cannot be disconnected any longer from other sectorial approaches. Cultural heritage policies need to be adopted and implemented holistically by integrating the care, protection and proper use of heritage in all related policies, programmes and actions (urban affairs, public spaces, educational programmes, etc.).

111. This can be achieved through the reinforcement of participatory governance and through the structured and systematic inclusion of all stakeholders and civil society in developing strategies and policies for cultural heritage. It is also recommended to systematically connect cultural heritage to regional and local sustainable development as a strategic resource for “smart, sustainable and inclusive growth” and as the basis for fostering “inclusive, innovative and reflective societies” in the preparation for the Structural Funds.

<p>The Adopt-a-Monument scheme developed in Scotland in the 1990s, responds to the demands of community groups who wish to engage with their local heritage and supports them in taking care of it. Interested individuals or groups can set up projects and sign an agreement with Archeology Scotland (which is a membership organization which seeks to promote the understanding of archeology in Scotland)? The scheme allows participants to develop skills in archeological conservation.</p>

6.3 Re-thinking contested heritages in Europe (link to “blind spot” 5.2)

112. Dominant narratives in Europe focus on shared cultural heritage and often the hypothesis of cultural heritage as a means of separation and conflict, including actual armed conflict, is avoided as a narrative taboo. However, recent events, such as war in former Yugoslavia, demonstrated that cultural heritage bonds oppositions and suffers from them. Deconstructing and reconstructing the discourse around these conflicts and openly addressing issues surrounding contested cultural heritage could help to decrease conflict escalation.

113. Cultural heritage could be both the reason of conflict and the means of its resolution. This approach primarily implies the need to identify contested cultural heritage and the relevant stakeholders through a participatory and bottom-up process. It invites to listen to the community and its various concerns. Co-analysis of the various concerns and co-creation by the means of co-designing cultural actions that engage with contested heritage can lead to openly speaking of and eventually exorcising divisions.

114. Civil society must play a leading role in this element of the strategy in order to promote the idea of shared heritage as means of resolving conflict⁷². This approach intends to decrease conflict through education, discussions and cultural engagement. Although it implies a bottom-up participation and community involvement, it clearly requires a policy-driven approach, particularly identifying and building on available best practices⁷³.

115. For example, a “citizen tourist” program within cities and regions (link to “blind spot” 5.7) could invite cities and regions to create platforms facilitating the temporal integration of tourists and visitors in cities, through their immersion in local programs. This initiative aims to go beyond current programs of “creative tourism” to further facilitate tourist-local encounters. It could allow tourists to offer short term language classes, translation or other skills and know-how. In turn, tourists could have access to local municipal services usually reserved to local residents (libraries, athletic facilities, etc.).

6.4 Acknowledging cities as main players of cultural diplomacy (link to “blind spot” 5.2)

116. Decentralising cultural diplomacy and empowering cities as main players of cultural diplomacy based on cultural heritage seems to be the way forward. Diasporas hold great potential for enhancing Europe’s capacity to engage with the world in a horizontal manner. As many European cities are home to diaspora communities that receive municipal subsidies to organise cultural projects to maintain relations with their countries of origin, it seems as a positive step to further embed these activities into the cities’ wider international cultural relations strategy.

117. Diaspora communities have the potential to become bridges to third countries by implementing concrete cultural heritage projects. This approach can contribute to decentralise the reach of European cultural diplomacy, empower local communities and contribute to transnational cultural heritage projects within Europe and with third countries. It contributes to give cities real consideration as partners implementing intercultural dialogue. Beyond large cities, these initiatives could create transnational networks connecting with more diverse territories.

118. Supporting and fostering the development of networks of diaspora/migrant communities on cultural heritage cooperation (link to “blind spot” 5.2 and 3) could contribute to realise the potential of cities as international cultural actors and to develop new city networking initiatives within Europe. Inspired by URBACT networks for sustainable urban development at the European level (such the INT-HERIT implementation network which brings together a group of small and medium-sized European cities around the common goal of revitalising the local cultural heritage), cultural heritage networks could be created based on subjects that connect cities throughout the world and foster mutual understanding across continents.

72 EENCA, Platforms on the Future of Cultural Heritage: A problem solving approach, p.25 https://ec.europa.eu/culture/sites/culture/files/report_on_the_dublin_platform_on_heritage_and_social_innovation.pdf

73 Idem

6.5 Supporting and reinforcing major European initiatives on cultural heritage financially (link to “blind spots” 5.2, 3 and 4)

119. Some of the main European heritage initiatives presented in part 1, such as the Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe program or the European Heritage Label play a major role to the foundation of European identity. They are meant to represent Europe, and to convey major messages on common cultural grounds of Europe. They need considerable financial and communication reinforcement in order to be able to fulfil their task.

120. Expanding the current programme of the European Capital of Culture programme to other countries could encourage to share cultural influences and foster the development of bridging cultural heritage programs ((link to “blind spot” 5.3). It would convey the message of a Europe open to the world, supporting exchanges and working on transnational narratives and go beyond the current initiatives with cities in European accession countries. It could foster transnational collaboration between local and regional authorities in Europe with those of on other continents. The Congress South-Med Partnership programme adopted in 2017 could be a vector of this effort.

121. Launching a European Intangible Heritage label (link to “blind spots” 5.5 and 6) inspired by the European Heritage label is one of the ideas that have circulated. In the spirit of the Faro convention, such a new instrument could focus on heritage communities in Europe, that are the producers and the custodians of intangible heritage. The label could offer the possibility of regular celebrations such as a Trans-European Intangible Cultural heritage festival. Intangible heritage would offer new European perspectives by viewing and assessing how different forms of urban art relate to the mainstream creative industry. It would contribute to new forms of inclusiveness in the cultural heritage of urban minorities, nurture creativity and the cultural industries.

6.6 Reinventing public spaces as platforms for cultural heritage (link to “blind spots” 5.5 and 6)

122. Beyond their own interest as heritage places, public spaces are the locations on which cultural heritage practices (representations, performances, encounters and interactions) take place. More often, public spaces are both heritage sites and locations of heritage practices. However, current research underlines that public space appears to be under threat.⁷⁴ Public spaces are becoming dominated by their commercial rather than communal function. If nothing is done to reinvent them, the potential of cities and their public spaces as platforms for collective expression and democratic discourse and problem solving will not be able to live up to their potential.⁷⁵ This proposal could combine participatory placemaking⁷⁶ and cultural heritage initiatives.

6.7 Creating University networks on European cultural heritage (link to “blind spot” 5.1 and transversally to the implementation of the other blind spots)

123. European universities play a major role on Cultural heritage research and dissemination of knowledge. University research, especially research on social sciences and humanities, is crucial in understanding the importance of cultural heritage in the society and its potential for social cohesion, economic growth and sustainable development. Several networks already exist such as UNITWIN networks or Networks working in collaboration with the EPA on Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe. Some newly funded European University Alliances, such as UNA Europa⁷⁷, defined Cultural Heritage as one of the main focuses for research and pedagogy.

124. Universities work closely with local and regional authorities and are well connected with the local communities. They have developed specific tools and methods to fight against exclusion of their students. They also are well connected to universities in countries outside of their immediate network. They can therefore represent important players for the implementation of several projects and initiatives

74 European Economic and Social Committee, Culture, Cities and Identity in Europe, p. 8, 2016 <https://www.eesc.europa.eu/resources/docs/qe-01-16-463-en-n.pdf>

75 Culture Action Europe and Agenda 21 for Culture, 2016, Culture, Cities and Identity in Europe, Study, Brussels: “Visits and Publications” Unit. <https://www.eesc.europa.eu/en/our-work/publications-other-work/publications/culture-cities-and-identity-europe>

76 How participatory placemaking can help URBACT Local Groups to develop urban actions for public spaces in our cities, 2019 <https://urbact.eu/how-participatory-placemaking-can-help-urbact-local-groups-develop-urban-actions-public-spaces-our>

77 <https://www.una-europa.eu/>

aiming to use heritage as a tool for promoting and sharing the core values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law.

THE UNIVERSITY NETWORK FOR CULTURAL ROUTES STUDIES: Created in 2012, with the aim of facilitating exchange between universities active in the field of Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe and the Cultural Routes, the Network aims to encourage academic research on Cultural Routes and related issues, encourage students to carry out their academic research on the Programme, apply jointly to European Funds, participate in the programme of activities of the Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe Programme and offer scientific advice when required. It also constitutes a platform for the exchange and mobility of students and researchers.

7. CONCLUSION: Towards a transnational model of cultural and touristic management by regions

125. Cultural heritage creation, preservation and promotion is part of local and regional competences. It is necessary to identify the areas that need further development and to highlight emerging issues for which it is urgent to produce new tools and instruments or more actively implement policies on the basis of existing studies.

126. Local and regional authorities have a major role in shaping how the past shapes the present and the future of their cities and regions. They are at the forefront of culture-led development thanks to greater local autonomy, the ability to attract high-talent individuals and their proximity to their inhabitants' needs and potential.

127. Their policies and actions on cultural heritage allow them to engage with diverse communities within and across borders, to reconcile conflicting narratives and boost the economic strength of their territories to achieve higher living standards. By bringing different stakeholders together, local authorities can contribute to improving sustainable economic development, social inclusion and participatory governance.

128. By adapting and transforming cultural heritage policies in order to assist economic and sustainable development, urban regeneration and tourism, local and regional authorities can promote intercultural dialogue and strengthen social cohesion by involving local citizens and improving cooperation with disconnected communities. Cities that invest in culture can reap substantial rewards, attracting more jobs and human capital than other comparable cities. In rural areas, restoration and upgrading of cultural and natural heritage contributes to growth potential and sustainability.

129. Local and regional authorities, based on their competences, can take measures to acquire information and improve their knowledge base. They can develop policies, take action and engage in networking to promote and preserve cultural heritage, and highlight emerging issues (such as climate change, "over-tourism" or public health emergencies) for which it is urgent to produce new tools and instruments or more actively implement policies on the basis of existing studies.

130. They can develop and improve bottom-up and inclusive governance schemes which address inequalities and territorial differences between regions and city areas, the lack of data and indicators beyond strict economic considerations and the lack of efficient tools for the preservation of the intangible aspects of urban or rural landscapes.

131. The initiatives presented in this report, notably the policy-related proposals, might be considered ambitious while some others are easier to implement. The rapporteurs would highlight, nonetheless, that it is necessary to systematically connect any new short- and medium-term action to an existing one. All new activities must take roots in existing projects. And they must systematically consider how they can remain sustainable while monitoring the implemented actions.

132. The rapporteurs underline that the measures indicated in the report aim to progressively build a transnational model of cultural heritage management by regional and local authorities. This seems today as the most "modern" and future-oriented direction Europe can take for its cultural heritage.