

**EUROPEAN  
EXPERT  
NETWORK  
ON CULTURE  
(EENC)**

***Challenges and Priorities  
for Cultural Heritage in Europe:  
Results of an Expert Consultation***

EENC Paper, September 2013

### **About this document**

This document has been prepared by the secretariat of the European Expert Network on Culture (EENC), at the request of Directorate-General for Education and Culture of the European Commission (DG EAC). It results from the analysis of replies provided by a group of European experts to the questionnaire prepared by the EENC. The list of respondents and the full questionnaire can be found in the annex.

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

The EENC was set up in 2010 at the initiative of DG EAC, with the aim of contributing to the improvement of policy development in Europe. It provides advice and support to DG EAC in the analysis of cultural policies and their implications at national, regional and European levels. The EENC involves 17 independent experts and is coordinated by Interarts and Culture Action Europe.

## **Contents**

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1. Background	4
1.2. Document structure	5
<b>2. Challenges for Cultural Heritage in Europe</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Exploring and deepening the understanding on the values of heritage</i>	5
<i>Dealing with a changing resource context</i>	7
<i>Fostering contemporary, participative interpretation models</i>	7
<i>Promoting access and participation in heritage and its management</i>	9
<i>Fostering an integrated understanding of heritage (tangible &amp; intangible)</i>	10
<i>Reflecting on new (and old) threats to heritage preservation</i>	11
<i>Addressing professional and institutional development needs</i>	12
<b>3. Suggested Priorities for the EU</b>	<b>13</b>
<i>Promoting the exchange of information and good practices among Member States</i>	13
<i>Fostering the place of heritage in sustainable development</i>	14
<i>Fostering new narratives and interpretation models</i>	15
<i>Providing support to European networks and platforms</i>	16
<i>Promoting training and institutional development</i>	16
<i>Facilitating access through heritage digitisation</i>	17
<i>Addressing lesser-explored heritage areas</i>	17
<i>Preventing the illicit traffic of cultural heritage assets</i>	18
<i>Stimulating funding partnerships</i>	18
<b>Annex 1: Questionnaire</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Annex 2: List of respondents</b>	<b>21</b>

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Background

In August 2013, the Directorate General for Education and Culture of the European Commission (DG EAC) submitted a request to the EENC, for the identification of the main challenges for cultural heritage in Europe and the policy areas in which future action at EU level could provide more substantial value added, through a consultation with experts in this field. The results of the consultation should inform DG EAC's ongoing reflections in the field of cultural heritage, including new policy activities foreseen for 2014.<sup>1</sup>

The consultation exercise has involved the distribution of a common questionnaire to 10 experts in the field of cultural heritage, distributed by the EENC secretariat in early September 2013. The questionnaire mainly asked respondents to identify the main challenges to cultural heritage in Europe today and the potential priorities for the EU in this area in the coming 3-5 years.<sup>2</sup> Given the extensive number of professionals who could have been invited to take part in this consultation and the thematic and geographic breadth of the exercise, selection criteria included the diversity of areas of expertise (e.g. heritage management and preservation, economic and social relevance of cultural heritage, etc.), the diversity of countries and the diversity of institutional contexts (i.e. experts working for public institutions, private consultants, academics, etc.).<sup>3</sup>

In the context of the consultation, a broad definition of cultural heritage has been adopted, based on the Council of Europe's 2005 Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (also known as 'Faro Convention'):

*"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."*<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> DG EAC's request of August 2013 also involved the identification of relevant quotes on cultural heritage and its importance in Europe, coming from a diverse range of countries and approaches. Work on this task is being carried out in parallel to the consultation exercise and will result in a separate document, to be submitted to DG EAC in late October 2013.

<sup>2</sup> The questionnaire has been enclosed in Annex 1. In addition to the two issues mentioned above, an additional question regards the identification of relevant quotes on the importance of cultural heritage for Europe, which will be used for the separate collection of quotes (see above, note n°1).

<sup>3</sup> The list of respondents has been included in Annex 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, Faro, 27.10.2005, article 2.a. Available at <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/Treaties/Html/199.htm>.*

When analysing the challenges and priorities in cultural heritage from a public policy perspective, experts responding to the questionnaire were invited to consider both those aspects directly related to cultural heritage as a sector (e.g. protection, preservation, management, training) and those which foster its relevance to other areas of development (e.g. economic impacts, tourism, social cohesion, landscape preservation).

## **1.2. Document structure**

This document has been produced by the EENC secretariat on the basis of the 9 replies collected within the deadline provided. Following this introduction, Section 2 summarises the main challenges to cultural heritage in Europe identified by experts. Items have been listed in an approximate order according to their frequency in experts' replies and, insofar as possible, have been grouped to ensure internal coherence.

Section 3 presents the main areas of potential involvement for the EU identified in the consultation, which have also been listed in accordance with their recurrence in the responses collected. Suggested policy priorities are often, but not always, aligned with the main challenges identified in the previous section.

A number of quotes from the questionnaires received have been reproduced for the sake of clarity throughout the text, although authors are not named. The names of experts consulted in the course of the exercise can be found in Annex 2. The EENC Secretariat thanks all contributors and remains solely responsible for the final piece, as well as for any inaccuracies contained herein.

## **2. Challenges for Cultural Heritage in Europe**

This section presents a summary of the main challenges for cultural heritage in Europe in the next few years, on the basis of suggestions made by experts.

### ***Exploring and deepening the understanding on the values of heritage***

Several questionnaire respondents highlighted the importance of fostering a discussion and further understanding on the meaning and value of cultural heritage in contemporary society. By **recognising both its intrinsic aspects and those related**

**to other dimensions of development** (e.g. economic, social, environmental aspects) and identifying existing or potential tensions between them, such exercises should provide the basis for the design and implementation of new policies and programmes or the replication of existing good practices.

In the words of one respondent, **determining whether heritage is seen as a capital or as a burden** would have important implications at policy and programme level:

*'What is heritage: alienated remnants of past cultures or organic elements of contemporary culture? Shall we make heritage work for the society today, or are we preserving it merely to be passed on to the future generations? Can the dilemma of heritage as capital/burden be reconciled through the notion of sustainable development? There are economic and social angles to consider in this regard.'*

Several specific areas of synergy which deserve further exploration were raised by experts in their replies, as briefly described below:

- ▶ **Heritage and the broader creative economy:** the digital shift and its consequences in the heritage sector generate a stronger coherence with developments in the broader creative economy, which should be further explored.
- ▶ **Heritage and cultural diversity:** heritage is related to issues of identity and diversity, which are of increasing relevance in Europe; its social and economic dimension can also be relevant to the agenda of the diversity of cultural expressions in the UNESCO context and, more generally, in cultural policy.
- ▶ **Heritage and education:** the importance of fostering broader awareness of the importance of heritage and its meaning through educational programmes, particularly among children and young people, was highlighted in several replies.

The recognition of these areas of synergy could provide the basis for **strengthening the place of heritage in broad territorial development strategies**, informing policy fields such as tourism, education, social inclusion, etc., particularly if this were coupled with participative interpretation techniques exploring the value of cultural heritage to local communities.

Some respondents stressed that, whilst a more complex understanding of heritage and its place in sustainable development exists in some regions, **the situation remains uneven** and it is necessary to foster the adoption of new strategies in lesser-developed regions, by favouring training, communication and capacity-building.

The diverse values of heritage can be said to underpin several of the reflections presented below and also inspire several of the priority areas identified for future EU policy in this field.

### ***Dealing with a changing resource context***

Implicitly or explicitly, several replies addressed the impact of the financial crisis, including the reduction in public budgets for culture but also other aspects, on the heritage sector: budget cuts in heritage policies, staff reduction, reorganisation of heritage institutions to reduce management positions, reduction in private sponsorship and access to credit for heritage institutions, etc.

Overall these developments lead to a **diminished capacity to protect and preserve heritage and to make it accessible**, as well as **difficulties in ensuring the day-to-day running** of new museums and heritage sites which had often required major investment efforts in the context of urban or rural regeneration strategies.

Whilst this issue may be seen as a shared concern, some respondents also referred to a **potential regional imbalance**, by highlighting how budget cuts at national, regional and/or local level have affected in particular Greece, Spain, parts of Italy as well as parts of Eastern Europe and the UK and Ireland, whilst other countries have been less severely affected. This has implications not only in terms of preservation in some of the Member States with the highest density of monuments and sites but also as regards the **ability of heritage institutions in some Member States to take part in European collaboration projects** and platforms which require co-financing, thus affecting the exchange of practices and the ability to develop common European narratives.

The current resource environment can be seen as a background factor, which underpins some of the challenges identified hereafter, including the need to develop more participative interpretation models (to enhance social legitimacy and understanding of heritage value) and the importance of adapting management models and professional skills to new circumstances.

### ***Fostering contemporary, participative interpretation models***

The importance of re-thinking existing interpretation models to foster new, more participative approaches emerges as a shared concern, in the light of the responses received. The observation of responses shows that the adoption of these models is promoted on the grounds of **political and social legitimacy** and of **operational and fundraising effectiveness**, but also on the basis of human rights, including **heritage rights** as recognised in the Faro Convention.

Several experts highlighted the need to **bridge the gap between the intentions of heritage professionals and the perceptions of the general public**, arguing that the success of heritage projects generally depends more on their social acceptability than their expert accuracy. Particular emphasis was placed on the **involvement of young people** in heritage awareness and interpretation exercises, whereas some voices also referred to the need to **break barriers between the cultural sector and other professional and policy fields**, since *'experts and operators ... give for granted that the quantity and quality of heritage, landscape and cultural resources, constitute one of Europe's core assets [and] there is surprise when heritage is neglected in the political agenda.'* Therefore, *'the integrated approach and cross-sectorial contamination between different sectors is a vital resource for our future.'* Limited connections with the broader society and the non-ability to develop accessible discourses are two of the factors which lead to the value of cultural heritage being underestimated in society.

Fostering community participation in heritage interpretation exercises should contribute, in the first place, to the **development of a more democratic narrative within communities**, thus strengthening legitimacy and cohesion: *'Heritage narrative works as glue holding together the past and present, as well as bridging different cultures and value systems.'* Whilst heritage, and particularly immovable heritage, can be regarded as an asset of territorial cohesion, **promoting an awareness of the multi-identity nature of heritage** can serve to counter the nationalistic understanding of heritage. In this respect, new interpretation models should integrate an intercultural interpretation of heritage, particularly in communities where different cultures co-exist.

This recognition of diversity and promotion of an intercultural perspective also informs the second area in which new narratives are requested, namely the **promotion of new heritage narratives for Europe**. Further development and research on interpretation models allowing for a contemporary European narrative, which may be seen *'as a point of departure for the journeys to different historic and cultural destinations'*, emerged as a challenge for several authors. Again, the importance of linking this process to developments in the educational sphere and involving children and young people should be a priority, so as to **prevent the idea of Europe from being exclusively attached, in the minds of the younger generations, to the economic context and to current economic policies**. However, some voices warned that divergent models as regards the place of heritage within education (with countries in Southern and South Western Europe favouring education *about* heritage and those in Northern and North Eastern Europe preferring to foster learning *through* heritage experiences) rendered common developments in this field difficult.

Yet the main threat to the emergence of new, participative and democratic narratives for European heritage may lie on the current strengthening of some national



discourses, which in some cases run counter to European and global values, including the recognition of human rights. *'Archives, museums, art galleries and heritage sites in the [Member States] which are living with the many socio economic marks of the current crisis may be tempted to play along with the nationalistic political forces in their country or may even be financially stimulated or forced to do so.'* Worsening political, religious and social tensions in some countries, both in the EU and in neighbouring regions, were seen as a threat not only to a democratic narrative for Europe but also to the objective protection of cultural heritage, including that of national minorities.

Of course, the development of **new interpretation models should be based on the use of innovative techniques**, aiming to reinforce the links between people and heritage by enabling communities and individuals to access the stories embodied in heritage: *'those of the works of art themselves, those of the artists who created them, but also those of the visitors questioning them and finding unexpected resonances with their feelings, memories and life experiences.'* Existing good practices in this field should be further promoted and exchanged.

### ***Promoting access and participation in heritage and its management***

Even though recent years have seen an increased interest in the notion of access to culture and the adoption of policies and programmes in this field at European, national, regional and local levels, several respondents stressed the need to further current efforts. Heritage institutions should, among others, stimulate the **design of programmes and activities aimed at children and young people**.

The need to **pursue current efforts in heritage digitisation and the production of accessible databases, as well as a stronger integration of technology** in the work of heritage organisations were identified as important challenges by some respondents: *'While research projects are financed for laser-scanning, 3D modelling, and digital cartography, in daily heritage management procedures we are still tributary to paper-based work style: written forms, slow flow of documents. There is still sporadic use of online databases, mobile phone recording, GPS and other non-expensive, modern means of inventorying, monitoring, reporting and communicating. Digitization of cultural heritage, while encouraged at European level (Europeana) is underfinanced in many countries.'* Steps in this field could include the **promotion of open-source and participative databases for the public across Europe**, whilst ensuring that the information used is reliable, comprehensive and unbiased. Ultimately, the **high quality of cultural contents** in digitisation exercises should be guaranteed.

On the other hand, some respondents warned that **digital access can never replace part of the pleasure of traditional, analogue access** to original heritage, nor the potential social benefits (sharing ideas and thoughts among generations, learning together) which access in groups to museums, heritage sites and galleries brings.

In addition to the promotion of participative models in interpretation and of programmes stimulating access to heritage assets, measures **to foster participation in the management of heritage sites** should also be taken. New approaches in this area should involve a **stronger civil society engagement**, which remains a challenge in many Member States.

### ***Fostering an integrated understanding of heritage (tangible & intangible)***

The adoption of the 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage and other related measures have contributed to the expansion of the remit of cultural heritage, where the place of intangible heritage is now universally recognised. However, methodological challenges in this area remain, since **heritage institutions in Europe maintain a central focus on the preservation and interpretation of objects**.

The development of **integrated heritage strategies, bringing together tangible and intangible aspects, emerges** as a need for the next few years. Specific measures should include, among others, the promotion of intergenerational transmission of heritage and specialised training, so as to prevent the loss of traditional skills and crafts in some regions, the resulting effects in cultural diversity and, more generally, its impact in terms of social cohesion and cultural preservation.

A number of specific heritage areas were identified as requiring particular attention in the context of integrated heritage strategies or through the adoption of specific approaches, as presented hereafter:

- ▶ **Recent heritage and historical memory:** it is often difficult to determine which aspects of the recent past need to be preserved, yet at the same time in the rapidly-changing world common objects can easily get lost – therefore, attention should be paid to contemporary collecting, an area in which some good examples already exist (e.g. Sweden’s Samdok). On the other hand, new possibilities for the preservation of oral historical memory, including institutional and individual memory, emerge thanks to the new technologies.
- ▶ **Difficult, controversial or dissonant heritage:** appropriate methodologies should be articulated as regards elements of history, particularly recent history, which do

not refer to beauty, glory or wisdom, but to less positive aspects of mankind. Dealing with the heritage of the Holocaust, the Gulag, the Troubles or the Balkan Wars, among others, remains a challenge.

- **Heritage of the Digital Age:** several respondents addressed the need to determine selection criteria and adequate procedures for the preservation and management of contemporary heritage which only exists in a digital format: e-mails, blogs, images, messages in the social media, sound files, etc. *'What does it mean to preserve digital matter? Is it just files that we must preserve, or also software and hardware that have been used to create them? ... Does the notion of conservation apply in this case? How [is] the problem of compatibility to be solved, as files [may have been] composed using the software long gone? What happens to the contents of a person's computer, or e-mail account, or blogs after their death? Is there any legislation in place to handle such digital legacy?'* This affects, among others, archives, the role of which in ensuring democratic access to knowledge may depend on their ability to conceive suitable selection, storage and access policies.

Alongside the need to consider these less traditional areas of heritage, some authors also **warned of the importance of discussing the limits of heritage:** resources allocated to heritage collection and preservation may be overstretched by the progressive broadening of heritage definitions, whilst the value of heritage itself may become too relative by *'the perception that everything in relation with human life and creativity is equally of interest'*. Therefore, a number of key questions should be addressed: *'Is there a limit to physical growth of heritage? Can our economy support forever the increasing number of [objects]? Or, perhaps, we shall think of the ways to make them work and be useful to the society.'*

### **Reflecting on new (and old) threats to heritage preservation**

The consequences of **climate change** on heritage preservation and restoration methods came up as a recurrent concern: contrasts of temperature, floods, extensive fires, landslides, etc. Heritage institutions should reflect both on the direct impact of these threats and on its broader societal implications, including the search for **more energy-efficient management models within museums and other heritage institutions**. Whilst circumstances vary widely from country to country, this issue arose as an area of concern at European level, as did the **lack of adequate policies to address new environmental challenges** in most countries and regions.

A number of factors related to human pressure on heritage sites and its negative effects on sustainable preservation were also mentioned. They included **infrastructure developments, the expansion of urban areas, intensive agriculture and**

**deforestation, as well as mass tourism** in some heritage cities and sites, which overall threaten archaeological sites, historic city centres, historic landscapes, local cultural identities and, ultimately, the whole heritage context and its 'atmosphere'. Striking the right balance between opposed interests and ensuring adequate heritage protection and preservation emerged as a challenge for the near future.

Finally, some authors warned of the **increase of illicit traffic of cultural heritage goods**, through the use of more sophisticated methods and existing corruption, vulnerabilities and the black market, particularly in Eastern and Southern Europe. Illicit traffic is made easier by the de-regulation of the art market in current legislation, insufficient border controls and the costs and complexity attached to the recovery process – it would be necessary to reflect on these issues and foster harmonisation in legislation and policies where possible.

#### ***Addressing professional and institutional development needs***

Several replies addressed the **need to provide training opportunities** to heritage professionals, in areas such as **communication and marketing** but also for more **traditional areas of heritage management**: curators, archaeologists, art historians, restorers, traditional crafts workers. *'Cultural heritage protection is a field that needs continuity and experience, a [long training period]. In museums, heritage institutes and cultural administration there are less and less heritage experts.'*

At the institutional level, in addition to the calls made to foster citizen participation in management practices (see above), other respondents also highlighted the need to **adopt elements from private management models, in order to enhance fundraising opportunities and successful preservation**: *'Cultural heritage can become an important [asset] for local economies, but we need to apply new methodologies to manage it, conserving its collective and public character and ensuring its physical protection.'*

### **3. Suggested Priorities for the EU**

This section synthesises replies provided by experts as regards the policy priorities which could guide EU action in the field of cultural heritage in the next few years. As in the previous chapter, proposals have been grouped thematically and are listed in approximate order of importance and frequency in the replies collected – however, the order of policy priorities in this case is not necessarily the same of the previous identification of challenges. Where possible, specific responsibilities for different EU bodies have been indicated.

It is also worth noting that policy priorities include both *heritage themes* (e.g. promoting the interdependencies between cultural heritage and other areas of sustainable development, fostering new narratives and interpretation models, etc.) and *policy methods* (e.g. fostering the exchange of good practices among Member States, supporting networks, etc.).

#### ***Promoting the exchange of information and good practices among Member States***

This traditional area of work for the European Commission and the Council emerges as a frequent request in experts' recommendations. EU institutions should foster the exchange of information and good practices at policy level but, particularly, at programme level for heritage institutions, in areas including the following:

- ▶ **audience development, access and participation** in heritage institutions, including their relations with tourism, education and social innovation;
- ▶ **educational and learning strategies** in museums and heritage institutions;
- ▶ **promotion of new standards in preservation;**
- ▶ **dynamic heritage management**, including the ability of new heritage management models to foster creative entrepreneurship, supporting local development and improving quality of life – an area in which cooperation between different Commission DGs (DG EAC, DG REGIO, DG Environment), Member States and local and regional authorities should be fostered; and
- ▶ **the impact of key trends and relevant drivers of change (technology, environment, etc.)** on the protection, conservation and enhancement of cultural heritage, which could benefit of support through the EU's research programmes, among others.

Among the methods suggested to address these issues are:

- ▶ the promotion of **professional exchange and mobility**;
- ▶ the promotion of **commonly-agreed methodologies and comparable data** to formulate evidence-based policies in the sector, including by developing quantitative and qualitative **indicators** and encouraging the collection and analysis of data at Europe-wide level;
- ▶ the provision of support to **think-tanks addressing emerging challenges at European level**; the establishment of a European Observatory of Cultural Heritage, focusing on audiences, tourism, climate change and sustainability, and management models was also suggested.

### ***Fostering the place of heritage in sustainable development***

In the light of the *Europe 2020* strategy's objectives of **smart, sustainable and inclusive growth** and with a view to the final design and implementation of a new generation of programmes for the 2014-2020 period, including in the **Structural Funds** (ERDF, ESF, etc.), some respondents asked for the strengthening of the transversality of cultural heritage with regard to other public policies and the reinforcement of the place of cultural heritage in regional development strategies.

Some respondents identified a certain **geographic imbalance among Member States**, with some having already analysed and explored the social and economic value of cultural heritage and others with much less experience in this field – it is particularly on the latter where efforts should focus. Further to the exchange of successful models, suggestions were made for research methodologies to be refined and shared and for guidelines and toolkits to be provided to national, regional and local authorities and heritage institutions to assess the social and economic impact of existing policies and programmes and improve performance in this field.

The synergies and **interdependencies between cultural heritage and the broader cultural and creative economy** are one of the areas which should be further explored in regional analyses and in the design and implementation of specific programmes and projects. Ultimately, this should contribute to fostering an understanding of how heritage institutions can generate income and create jobs themselves, rather than being solely an indirect source of income for the surrounding economy.

### ***Fostering new narratives and interpretation models***

In line with the identification of new interpretation models and the development of new narratives as challenges to the heritage sector, demands were made for EU institutions to promote the development of new approaches and innovative projects in this area.

In this respect, suggestions were made for the **development of a EU strategy for promoting the European dimension of heritage and the re-consideration of European narratives through heritage**, i.e. supporting cultural heritage of European significance, recognising heritage assets which embody values related to European and community cohesion, promoting heritage interpretation and education linked to European values, etc.

More generally, the **need for innovation in heritage interpretation techniques**, enabling citizens to make sense of contemporary lives through classic and recent heritage, was also highlighted.

These elements should inform European Commission programmes in the fields of culture, education, media, youth and regional development (including both in-country and cross-border cooperation) as well as heritage-based sustainable development at Member State level. Alternatively, existing national heritage strategies could be analysed in order to foster exchanges of information and experiences on issues common to heritage policies at national level, in a joint effort among several Commission DGs and Member States, thus also indirectly contributing to the European dimension in cultural heritage.

At micro level, **support should be provided to innovative integrated management experiences**, such as those represented by heritage communities, which can either be NGOs or operate as non-formal associations or networks of citizen initiatives in the field of heritage, and which embody the participative approach to interpretation and management. Likewise, the **involvement of younger generations in the management** of heritage sites and the promotion of innovative approaches which enable **an understanding of heritage's potential for personal fulfilment, leisure and employment** among children and young people should be promoted. This could be fostered through DG EAC's programmes and mechanisms, as well as Member States and other institutions.

### ***Providing support to European networks and platforms***

In addition to the exchange of information and good practices highlighted above, the support to permanent networks and platforms active in the field of cultural heritage was raised as a priority by several respondents.

Some authors warned that even though EU funding programmes have traditionally supported initiatives in this area, the small-scale and short-term nature of some beneficiary projects has led to their disappearance upon the end of funding. In this respect, the possibility of **supporting long-term networks and platforms with a broad geographical reach** should be considered. Support could be aimed at fostering, among others, the modernisation of the public heritage sector, the adoption of new, participative and democratic management models and the promotion of the creative re-use of heritage resources.

### ***Promoting training and institutional development***

As already noted, professional and institutional development emerged as a shared concern among several experts, who in turn proposed specific measures for future policies and programmes in this field, at different levels:

- ▶ support to the **provision of training to existing and future professionals** in core heritage activities (e.g. curators, archaeologists, etc.) as well as in related areas (e.g. promotion of universal access to heritage, heritage education, integrated management of heritage sites for sustainable development), including through mobility and peer-learning;
- ▶ contribution to **standard-setting and regulation** of training as well as professional and institutional development in the heritage field, through the development of a European framework for the training and qualification of heritage professionals as well as the provision of guidelines on staffing needs for different types of heritage institutions depending on the nature and size of collections.

As in other areas, respondents warned of existing regional imbalances across Europe, which may make it necessary for training efforts to focus particularly on Southern and Eastern Europe.



### ***Facilitating access through heritage digitisation***

In addition to other measures related to accessibility outlined above (e.g. synergies with educational programmes and with tourism), proposals related to the promotion of access referred in particular to the importance of pursuing recent efforts in the field of digitisation.

In particular, measures should be taken to **support more evenly R&D networks, ICT service providers and the research community**, on the one hand, and **heritage providers**, on the other. The latter were seen as key not only for the provision of contents for the purposes of education, creative industries, research, etc. but also for contextualisation of content and enrichment of services.

In terms of access, a suggestion was made for **open-source databases to be favoured**, while attention should be paid to ensuring economic sustainability through regulations concerning copyright and artistic production.

On the other hand, synergies between existing digital contents (e.g. Google Earth, Google Maps, Google Streetview) and **mobile technologies for inventory, monitoring, quick alert or crowdsourcing purposes** should also be examined and fostered.

### ***Addressing lesser-explored heritage areas***

In terms of heritage fields, a gap was identified as regards some less popular or explored areas, which could benefit from specific attention by EU institutions, as follows:

- ▶ **intangible heritage**, including both its identification and the development of guidelines for the submission of applications for recognition within UNESCO's Representative List, on the one hand, and the exploration of links with broader social and economic aspects of sustainable development, on the other;
- ▶ **recent heritage**, wherein criteria and good practices could be transferred in cooperation with Sweden's Samdok and ICOM's International Committee for Collecting (COMCOL), among others;
- ▶ **oral history projects**, including in particular those which deal with cross-border and cross-cultural issues and themes important for understanding European identity;

- ▶ **difficult, controversial or dissonant heritage**, which remains a challenge and wherein, just as in the case of intercultural dialogue around cultural heritage a few years earlier, good practices should be stimulated;
- ▶ **heritage of the Digital Age**, including the promotion of innovative and creative thinking but which also requires a good knowledge of ICT; this may provide the basis for a large-scale European project supported by the Commission.

### ***Preventing the illicit traffic of cultural heritage assets***

As noted above, the recurrence of illicit traffic in the field of heritage remains an issue of concern, particularly in some countries.

Steps in this field should include the promotion of **harmonised national legislation**, measures to foster **more strict regulation of the art market** and **improved border controls** of cultural heritage objects.

### ***Stimulating funding partnerships***

Given the current financial context, some authors called for the stimulation of combined funding models, including collaboration in heritage projects between **public and private** bodies as well as between **regional, national and European sources** of funding. Particular efforts in this respect should be made as regards the countries more severely affected by the financial crisis.

## **Annex 1: Questionnaire**

### **Questionnaire on Priorities and Challenges for Cultural Heritage in Europe September 2013**

#### ***Background***

At the request of the European Commission's Directorate-General for Education and Culture (DG EAC), the European Expert Network on Culture ([www.eenc.eu](http://www.eenc.eu)) is carrying out a consultation with experts in the field of cultural heritage, with the aim of identifying the main challenges for cultural heritage in Europe and the policy areas in which future action at EU level could provide more substantial value added. The results of the consultation will inform DG EAC's ongoing reflections in this field, including new policy activities on cultural heritage foreseen for 2014.

In the context of this consultation, a broad definition of cultural heritage, such as that provided by the Council of Europe's Faro Convention, is adopted.<sup>5</sup> When analysing the challenges and priorities in cultural heritage from a public policy perspective, both those aspects directly related to cultural heritage as a sector (e.g. protection, preservation, management, training) and those which foster its relevance to other areas of development (e.g. economic impacts, tourism, social cohesion, landscape preservation) can be taken into account.

We would like to thank you for agreeing to respond to this questionnaire. Individual replies will be summarised in a final report and names of respondents will be acknowledged in an annex, but the authors of individual sentences will not be named.

Replies should be sent **by 17 September 2013** to Jordi Baltà ([jbalta@interarts.net](mailto:jbalta@interarts.net)). He can also be contacted by e-mail, telephone (+34 934 877 022) or Skype (jbalta-interarts) to provide further clarification in advance.

#### ***Questionnaire***

**Name of respondent:**

**Post / Institution:**

**1. Which are, in your view, the main challenges to cultural heritage in Europe nowadays?**  
Please list between 5 and 10 issues which you identify as needs or opportunities, preferably in

---

<sup>5</sup> "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." *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*, Faro, 27.10.2005, article 2.a. Available at <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/Treaties/Html/199.htm>.

order of importance (the top challenges being presented first). Each item should be accompanied by a short description. Feel free to provide references to studies or policy documents if necessary. The total reply should not be longer than 2 pages.

**2. Which could be the priorities for the European Union in the field of cultural heritage in the next 3-5 years?** Please list 4-6 areas in which EU action could provide added value, related if possible to those mentioned in question 1. You may want to identify whether action should mainly involve the European Commission, the exchange of information and good practices among EU Member States or other forms of policy initiative. Feel free to provide references to studies or policy documents if necessary. The total reply should not be longer than 1.5 pages.

**3. Could you provide 2 or 3 quotes which in your view highlight the importance of cultural heritage for Europe?** These may come from policy documents, research reports or other sources. In the event that quotes are originally written in a language other than English, we would be grateful if you could provide us with the original text and an approximate translation.<sup>6</sup>

**4. Please use this space to provide any additional comments or ideas.**

**Thank you!**

---

<sup>6</sup> Some of these quotes will be used in a separate document currently being prepared by the EENC on behalf of DG EAC.

## **Annex 2: List of respondents**

This document has been prepared on the basis of replies provided by the following experts:

- ▶ Penelope Denu, Executive Secretary, Council of Europe Enlarged Partial Agreement on Cultural Routes; and Director, European Institute of Cultural Routes
- ▶ Cornelia Dümcke, Culture Concepts, Germany
- ▶ Claire Giraud-Labelle, Université Catholique de l'Ouest, Angers, France
- ▶ Mikhail Gnedovsky, Director, Cultural Policy Institute, Russia
- ▶ Antonio Nicolau Martí, Development Director, *Kultura, Ideas and Strategies for cultural heritage*, Spain
- ▶ Irina Oberländer Tarnoveanu, Cultural Heritage Consultant, National Heritage Institute, Romania
- ▶ Jelka Pirkovič, Director General, Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage, Slovenia
- ▶ Erminia Sciacchitano, Secretariat General, Ministry for Heritage, Cultural Activities and Tourism, Italy; and Chair, Steering Committee for Culture, Heritage and Landscape, Council of Europe
- ▶ Henrik Zipsane, Senior Researcher, the Nordic Centre of Heritage Learning and Creativity; and Professor, Linköping University, Sweden

The final text has been produced by the EENC Secretariat, which is solely responsible for any inaccuracies contained herein.